DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 065 669 VT 015 792

AUTHOR	Jakubauskas, Edward B., Ed.
TITLE	Proceedings of the Governor's Conference on Comprehensive Manpower Planning.
SPONS AGENCY	Iowa Office for Planning and Programming, Des Moines.; Iowa State Univ. of Science and Technology, Ames. Industrial Relations Center.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	161p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Conference Reports; *Federal State Relationship; Governmental Structure; Government Role; Information Needs; Interagency Coordination; *Manpower Development; *Public Policy; *Statewide Planning

ABSTRACT

This conference was held to lay the groundwork for identifying the ingredients of state-level manpower planning. Some of the issues discussed were revenue sharing, planning needs and goals, government role, and coordination of agencies and services in a comprehensive plan. The organization and characteristics of a manpower plan were described. (BH)

ED 065669

JUN 21 1972

Industrial Relations Center
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa 50010
Harold W. Davey, Director

Governor's
Conference on

COMPREHENSIVE MANPOWER PLANNING

(Robert D. Ray, Governor)
(Edited by Edward B. Jakubauskas)

Sponsored by

Iowa Office for Planning and Programming
Iowa State University Industrial Relations Center

June 1971

VT015 792

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE ON COMPREHENSIVE MANPOWER PLANNING

Edward B. Jakubauskas
Editor

Industrial Relations Center
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa
1972

Preface

Primary credit for conceptualizing and implementing the Governor's Conference on Comprehensive Manpower Planning should be given to the staff of the Iowa Office for Programming and Planning. Richard Madison conceived the basic idea of a Manpower Planning Conference and helped move the idea from "blueprint" stage to actual fruition. Walter Salomon suggested the basic format of the program. Gordon Bennett, State Manpower Director, provided overall direction.

Financial assistance for the sponsorship of the Conference was provided in part through the U. S. Department of Labor's manpower institutional grant.

Edward B. Jakubauskas
Editor

Table of Contents

		Page
Preface		i
Chapter 1.	Comprehensive Manpower Planning: An Overview Edward B. Jakubauskas	1
Chapter 2.	The Purpose and Need for Manpower Planning Governor Robert D. Ray	6
Chapter 3.	Federal-State Relations in Manpower Planning Daniel H. Kruger	12
Chapter 4.	Characteristics of a Good Manpower Plan Neal Hadsell	27
Chapter 5.	Manpower Planning at the State Level: Panel Discussion George Lundberg, Chad Wymer, Kenneth Wold	38
Chapter 6.	Organizing for Planning: Clarification of Federal, State, and Local Government Roles in Planning John K. Meskimen	70
Chapter 7.	An Emerging Manpower Need: Inter-agency Coordination George Beal	83
Chapter 8.	Goals and Objectives in the Planning Process Leonard Lecht	104
Chapter 9.	Complex Variables Affecting the Planning Process Arthur A. Kramish	120
Chapter 10.	A Summary of Workshop Sessions	126
Summary		136

CHAPTER 1

COMPREHENSIVE MANPOWER PLANNING: AN OVERVIEW

Edward B. Jakubauskas*

Almost a decade has passed since the initial enactment of the Manpower Development and Training Act. Over this period a vast array of programs and services has been made available to virtually all segments of the labor force. We have had programs for older workers, youth, the disadvantaged, the technologically displaced, those unemployed, and those employed but in need of upgrading. To accomplish the goal of improving the employability of those eligible for federal assistance, a vast array of categorical programs has been offered going far beyond classroom training and including virtually any remedy offering the possibility of increasing the skill, employability, or income of the individual.

The initiative for the development of these programs has been forthcoming at the federal level. The issues, priorities, and leadership have come largely from federal administrative departments. States and local communities have heretofore played only a passive role.

For the next few years, however, profound changes are on the horizon--not only for manpower programs but for a vast assortment of governmental services. The federal bureaucracy has become unwieldy,

---

*Currently, Dean of the College of Commerce and Industry, University of Wyoming. At the time of the Conference, Director, Industrial Relations Center, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.

local needs more urgent, and the need for organizational change has become imperative.

The past few years have demonstrated that a re-structuring of governmental services is needed. Communities and states will have to assume greater responsibility in planning, delivering, and evaluating manpower programs. And yet we must admit that if the federal government were to delegate greater responsibilities to states and communities, there would be a scarcity of planning models which could be emulated.

The purpose of the Governor's Conference on Comprehensive Manpower Planning was to initiate the groundwork for identifying the ingredients of manpower planning at the state level. If federal revenue-sharing were to become a reality how would states plan for the effective use of these funds? How do we arrange for the delivery of coordinated manpower services? What is the relation of individual state agencies in statewide planning, and how can these agencies relate to local areas within a state? What is the operational meaning of comprehensive manpower planning, and how does it give us better programs? These were a few of the questions suggested for the Conference and discussed by the speakers and participants.

Governor Robert D. Ray set the tone for the Conference in his keynote address by emphasizing that the process of planning should keep in mind the central purpose of providing good jobs for people and obtaining better governmental manpower services from the tax dollar. Also, Governor Ray called for a revitalization of the federal system by decentralizing federally-sponsored programs to the states. A state manpower planning system must, in turn, meet the criteria of relevance, reliability, and realism--and it must show the way to results in securing better jobs.

Professor Daniel Kruger reviewed in detail the history and complexities of federal-state relations in the manpower field and suggested active state participation in the formulation of guidelines and criteria for program administration. Also discussed in Professor Kruger's paper were current legislative proposals and administrative directives which would decentralize federal programs. Of particular importance was Interagency Cooperative Issuance 72-2 dated May 12, 1971 which was discussed in some detail. This provided for the establishment of State Manpower Planning Councils and virtually equal roles for governors and mayors in their councils.

Neal Hadsell, discussing the characteristics of a good manpower plan, proposes that good manpower planning should begin with current planning structures. The Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System (CAMPS) is recommended as a starting point. Proceeding with this as a basis, Mr. Hadsell suggests 10 characteristics of a good manpower plan, indicating that it must be:

(1) Viable
(2) Flexible
(3) Realistic
(4) Comprehensive
(5) Efficient
(6) Accurate
(7) Coordinated
(8) Cognizant of environmental factors
(9) Inclusive of all community resources
(10) Evaluated as to priorities and performance

George Lundberg, after reviewing the early development of manpower programs, advocates placing a high priority upon the development of better manpower data for planning purposes. As a corollary, Mr. Lundberg indicates that research should be adequately compensated in manpower agencies in order to attract competent personnel. Collection of

data is only the first step. Data must be organized in such a way as to be useful for decisionmaking.

Chad Wymer, Director of the Iowa Development Commission, called for more data on manpower and population at the local level to initiate a more effective integration of manpower planning with industrial development. In turn, the amount and potential development of new industry must be considered within the matrix of manpower planning.

Kenneth Wold, Department of Public Instruction, presented a "Manpower Needs Assessment Model" comprising 4 components: Statewide labor demand survey, statewide labor supply analysis, occupational preferences, and career education student followup.

John Meskimen reviewed current manpower legislative proposals and advocated working within CAMPS committees to develop more effective planning. Discussing Interagency Cooperative Issuance 72-2, Mr. Meskimen suggests building a planning system for local, state, and national levels through current structures rather than developing new and untried methods.

Dr. George Beal explored the varied and complex problems of organizational interrelationships and implications for manpower planning. Both vertical and horizontal organizational structures were discussed and models of coordination and planning in the manpower field were suggested.

Leonard Lecht poses two concepts of planning: (1) efficiency in use of budget resources and cost effectiveness; and (2) the concept of goal and priority formulation and the level of the budget as a variable rather than a constraint. The latter concept is discussed by Dr. Lecht including the complexities of shifting goals in the planning process. The tradeoffs are discussed in terms of a whole range of social, welfare, and manpower goals. Also, Dr. Lecht considers the whole labor force

spectrum--upgrading of the working poor, unemployed, etc. in the planning process.

Arthur Kramish specifies a number of variables which will determine the effectiveness of manpower planning. These include: Information or data base, coordinative interests, manpower for planning, creativity of the people we are planning for, policies or issues, political structures, attitudinal patterns of agencies or organizations, and the individualities of heads or representatives of these groups. Dr. Kramish perceives planning as a process by which strategic management is accomplished and made operational. Considering resource limitations and institutional constraints, planners ought to limit their prime attention to strategic areas of opportunity--areas in which there can be an impact.

In summary, the theme expounded by the speakers seemed to be that the planning process involved thinking ahead, involving numerous organizations and groups, and an underlying social welfare concern for the opportunity of the individual to raise his social and economic status in society. There was a distinct avoidance of rigid planning procedures in the various presentations. The end-result of the conference was a "first-step" toward manpower planning rather than a prescriptive "step-by-step" approach in planning.

CHAPTER 2

THE PURPOSE AND NEED FOR MANPOWER PLANNING

Robert D. Ray*

This is a working conference of central importance to Iowa's people. The task before you in the next two days -- namely, recommending new ways to plan more effectively for manpower services at the grass roots -- is the key to our efforts:

It is the key to our efforts for meeting Iowa's manpower needs;

It is the key to our efforts for obtaining greater effectiveness from the public dollars invested in manpower services; and

It is the key to our efforts for revitalizing our federal system by decentralizing manpower programs.

It is with a certain degree of anxiety that I talk to you about these three major purposes for manpower planning. The federal guidelines for comprehensive manpower planning have been revised significantly through an interagency agreement signed last week.

In reviewing a preliminary draft of the guidelines, we found that the Governor's role is perhaps the greatest change of all. Because of this action taken in Washington, the comprehensive manpower plan will be known in the future as "The Governor's Plan," and I must assume the role of "Chief State Manpower Planner" or some such title. Federal

---

*Governor of Iowa

agencies are increasingly recognizing the role of state governors in planning and coordinating the programs of all levels of government, and perhaps at some point in the future, governors will assume the title of "Statewide, Comprehensive, Intergovernmental, Coordinative Planner."

This increasing recognition of governors reminds me of the "Peanuts" cartoon in which Charlie Brown, before submitting to Lucy's psychiatric counseling service, says "Before we begin, what are your credentials?" Lucy then states her credentials as: "I know everything." And Charlie Brown then submits, saying: "Those are pretty good credentials."

Governors obviously don't "know everything," but we're often expected to, and that's what causes my anxiety in speaking to you today. Actually, I should be on the other side of the podium and each of you should be briefing me on manpower planning needs in your specific areas. And, in essence, that's why I invited you to participate in this conference.

In the next two days, I ask that you develop and recommend new models for interagency and intergovernmental planning to meet Iowa's manpower needs, in keeping with this new delegation of authority from federal agencies to "the grass roots."

Let me particularly stress the first of the major purposes of manpower planning, which I listed earlier: Our goal is to meet Iowa's manpower needs. While much of your discussion will inevitably involve the niceties of organization charts and agency jurisdictions, our greatest concern, in the end, must be with those Iowans who need manpower services -- who need, in simple language, <u>jobs</u>. In my new position as "Chief State Manpower Planner," I will hold the manpower agencies accountable for results, and I will demand evidence of accomplishments.

I have no intention this morning of listing Iowa's manpower needs, for you know them as well as any: the problems of our rural youth who aren't able to participate in Iowa's economy and who migrate out; the problems of black drop-outs in our central cities; the problems of Iowans whose skills are outmoded by the rapid pace of technology; and so on. I simply want to emphasize that all of our discussions of methods, procedures, planning models, jurisdictions, and the like are aimed at one central purpose: to provide Iowans with employment which supports themselves and their families, which gives them personal satisfaction, and which also contributes to the productivity of our economy. In short, the purpose is to get jobs for our people.

The second major purpose of manpower planning is that of obtaining greater effectiveness from the public dollars invested in manpower services. This purpose speaks for itself.

We are all aware of the money limitations of state and local government, and we are especially aware that the average taxpayer can bear only so much. Kenneth Boulding once wrote this:

> Planners! No matter how you fudge it, a plan's no good without a budget, and budgets don't grow very well without the power to tax or sell.

Unlike the way it used to be, our levels of government cannot call for major budget increases. To meet the public service needs of Iowa, we must continually undertake the hard task of priority-setting. We must have "more bang for the buck." Manpower programs -- old as well as new -- must increasingly be evaluated in terms of their effectiveness per dollar. This is one of the greatest tasks before you.

The third major purpose of manpower planning is that of revitalizing our federal system by decentralizing manpower programs.

We are in the midst of the greatest period of decentralization in American history. Never has there been so much to decentralize. I can tell you that there has never been a president more desirous of moving in this direction. We each have the opportunity and the obligation to demonstrate that "grass roots" decision-making is more effective, more efficient, and more equitable than top-down decision-making from Washington.

We all acknowledge the leadership which the federal government has demonstrated in manpower programs. A vast array of federal, categorical assistance programs has been created to provide virtually any remedy which might increase the skill, employability, or income of our citizens. Much has been accomplished and thousands of Iowans have benefitted.

Yet it is also obvious that this top-down effort has often failed to meet manpower needs for a variety of reasons.

First, national programs don't always fit local conditions. In Iowa, our rural areas are handicapped. National programs -- designed for more densely populated areas with easier transportation and communication -- don't provide adequate "outreach" services. Our underemployed and unemployed are harder to identify, contact, and involve in manpower programs. As another example, Iowa compares well with other states in high school completion rates. A significant number of these Iowans won't go on to college but still lack saleable skills. Yet they are not eligible for most federal training programs. This is a proportionately greater problem in Iowa than in other states, and our program priorities should be locally determined in order to accommodate that difference.

Secondly, national manpower programs can fail to meet local needs because of the very nature of the services needed. At the national level, manpower programs are developed in carefully defined categories,

to serve specific groups of people or types of problems. At the local service level, the individual client usually falls into several different groups and has several types of problems; in other words he doesn't fit the federal categories and only through an elaborate system of interagency referrals can we hope to meet his needs.

Our goal must be to mold the program for the individual, instead of forcing the individual to fit the mold of the agencies.

It is my strong belief that a grass roots oriented, manpower planning system could set better program priorities, to suit local needs, and could develop "custom-tailored" programs, to meet the needs of each individual. I have invited you to this conference in the hope that you will substantiate this belief of mine, by recommending methods for attaining such a local planning system.

I would hope, for example, that you can provide good advice on how we can provide equitable and balanced manpower services in all parts of the state, rural and urban. Is there an effective planning method to attain that end? I would hope, as another example, that you can propose ways to deliver manpower services so that they follow each individual all the way from dependence to independence, rather than dropping him along the way because of agency jurisdictions or too narrowly defined program categories.

I challenge you to respond to the new guidelines and possibilities, to help develop a manpower planning system which meets the three "R's" of good planning:

--Relevance: relevance to the people we must serve;

--Reliability: reliability in achieving what we promise; and

--Realism: Realism in recognizing our financial and personnel limitations and making the most of what we have.

And to these three "R's" I would add a fourth -- results: results that people get much needed jobs -- jobs with meaning and a sense of purpose so necessary to the well-being of the human spirit.

I am delighted that you have accepted my invitation. I look forward to your recommendations.

CHAPTER 3

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS IN MANPOWER TRAINING PROGRAMS

Daniel H. Kruger*

I have had a little experience at the state level in Manpower Planning. I have been Chairman of the Michigan Manpower Commission and presently I'm serving as Advisor on Manpower to Governor Milliken. Before we begin discussing Federal-State relations and Manpower Planning, we need to define some terms. The term, "relations," according to Webster's Dictionary, means connections between governmental units. It does not say anything about the quality of those relationships. Manpower is used to describe those activities relating to the development, maintenance, and utilization of those human resources already in the labor force, those in the labor force reserve, and those about to enter the labor force for the first time. This definition of manpower is not limited to the disadvantaged but to all human resources.

There are other definitions relating to manpower planning which need clarification: Manpower programs, Manpower services, and planning. Manpower programs are the structures through which manpower services are delivered. Manpower services are those services which the unemployed require in order to find employment. These include out-reach, counseling,

---

*Professor of Industrial Relations, School of Labor and Industrial Relations, Michigan State University.

orientation, job information, job development, training, as well as other important services. Planning means to devise a detailed method to accomplish a given objective.

Manpower services are welded or fabricated into a system through policy making and administration by an appropriate unit of government. Of utmost importance, this unit of government must have the authority to plan manpower programs through which manpower services are delivered.

Individuals involved in manpower must understand the complexity of the relationships involved in developing and implementing manpower programs. These programs are implemented through a complex network of governmental relationships. There are at least seven sets of relationships involved in manpower programs. Each of these relationships, which has its own peculiar characteristics, will be discussed briefly.

The first of these relationships is that between the federal agencies, primarily the Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Economic Opportunity. These agencies have had to develop ways of relating to each other in the planning and funding of manpower training programs, which was not an easy task. A second set of relationships involves the federal government and state agencies. Implementation of the federally supported manpower programs involves both federal departments and state agencies. The federal-state public employment system is an example of federal-state relationships. The Manpower Training and Development Act is jointly administered by the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare at the national level and by the

Employment Service and Vocational Education at the state level. A third set of relationships involves federal, state, and local relationships. For example, the institutional training of the Manpower Development and Training Act involves, at the federal level, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which provides the guidelines and the funds to the state vocational education agency which, in turn, negotiates with local school districts in some states to provide training programs. The Department of Labor, through the State Employment Security agency, pays the training allowance. A fourth set of relationships involves federal-local relationships. In some manpower programs the Department of Labor finances the program directly through local sponsors. Examples would be the OJT contract between the Department of Labor and Urban League affiliates or between the United States Department of Labor and the Chrysler Corporation. In the model cities and community action agency programs, direct grants are made by the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Office of Economic Opportunity, respectively.

At the state level, there are a number of agencies involved in implementing manpower programs. An effort to coordinate the activities of the state agencies is through CAMPS, Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System. Under the CAMPS concept, all of the state agencies are supposed to work together to develop the state plan. In some states, this has been a very painful exercise. In others, the state agencies have cooperated in developing and implementing manpower programs.

Another set of relationships which must be taken into account in discussing manpower programs is state-local relationships. Both state agencies and local governmental units and local organizations are

involved in manpower training efforts. For example, the State Employment Service has local offices scattered across the state. In some metropolitan areas the mayors have become interested in manpower, and the state employment service and the mayors of those cities have been working together in manpower activities. Still another set of state-local relationships is that of the state vocational education agency and the local school districts. The local school districts, as I indicated earlier, are involved in implementing institutional training programs under MDTA. A third type of state-local relationship is the relationship of the State Department of Welfare and a County Welfare office. This relationship will be enlarged significantly if a Family Assistance Program is enacted by the Congress.

Lastly, there are local relationships. In any community there are a number of governmental agencies and nonprofit groups involved in manpower. This includes a local office of the State Employment Service, local or county welfare office, local school districts, model cities groups, community action groups, urban leagues, employer groups, and unions, just to mention a few. All of these have to interact and interrelate with each other in developing a comprehensive manpower plan and program at the local level. These seven sets of intergovernmental relations underscore the complexity involved in the planning, the developing, the executing, and the delivering manpower services.

With such a complex set of relationships, mounting an effective national manpower effort is a herculean task replete with frustrations and disappointments. It takes real administrative skills to manage a program through this complex network of relationships. One frequently

hears the statement that if a nation can get a man on the moon, it should also be able to operate a manpower program successfully. However, a brief explanation is in order. It is much easier to get a man on the moon than to get a man into one of our manpower training programs. Let's take the space program--getting a man on the moon. The President of the United States declared that the nation would have a man on the moon by the end of the decade. Congress appropriated funds; NASA was created to manage the program. This federal agency contracted with subcontractors to get the necessary hardware. In time the space ship was launched and the national goal of getting a man on the moon was achieved. In reaching this goal the only important intergovernmental relationship was between the Congress and NASA, a unit of the Executive branch of the Federal Government. There was only the need for Congress to appropriate the necessary money to carry out the operation. The planning, developing, and implementing functions were the sole responsibility of one governmental agency. There was no maximum feasible participation. The governmental personnel were operating under one civil service system. Moreover, there was a clearly defined objective backed up with national funds. While there was intensive debate on the means necessary to achieve the objective, the debating did not involve countless state and local governmental officials as is the case in implementing manpower programs.

To return to federal-state relationships--with respect to the manpower considerations, there has been a relationship between the federal government and the state since 1933 when the United States Employment Service was established under the Wagner-Peyser Act. The initial problem of the Employment Service in the 1930's was to find jobs

for the unemployed workers during the great depression. When World War II came along, the Employment Service was federalized under the War Manpower Commission, but was returned to the states in 1946. The operation of the federal-state system of public employment offices between 1946 and 1960 was hardly exciting or creative. The Federal Government provided 100 percent financing of the State Employment Service. The State Employment Security Commission could and did operate as an almost completely independent unit of state government. Governors and legislators took almost no notice of the employment service, since no state funds were involved. Of course, the State Unemployment Insurance program did arouse interest because of the tax rate imposed on employers. The State Employment Service operated under federal guidelines and was accountable to the then Bureau of Employment Security in the U.S. Department of Labor. If the Bureau of Employment Security pushed the state agencies too hard, the battle cry of state rights was conveniently raised. Oftentimes, this was sufficient to have the Federal agency back off. When the governor or a state legislature tried to exert some influence on the Employment Security Commission, the Commission had a convenient way out, namely, federal policy could not permit such action.

From 1946 to 1960, things were rather calm. There were really no stresses and strains between the federal government, the Department of Labor, and the State Employment Security Commissions. The only problem was fund allocation. The states wanted their fair share of the funds under Title III, Social Security Act, as amended. There was some disagreement between federal and state government, but there was general consensus on the operation of the employment service.

A dramatic change occurred in the 1960's. Stresses and strains developed between the federal partner and the State Employment Security program. This relationship is in the process of evolving and will continue to evolve. In 1961, the Congress enacted the Area Redevelopment Act. It became the first of a long succession of Manpower and Education Acts in which all levels of government were to be involved. The Area Redevelopment Act, ARA, provided training opportunities for workers in depressed areas. State employment security agencies were assigned important responsibilities, such as identifying training needs, arranging for training opportunities, paying training allowances and placing the trainees for employment once the training was completed. Additional responsibilities were assigned to the State Employment Service under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. Not only were new responsibilities assigned to the State Employment Service, but also much more money was available. Soon after the Manpower Development and Training Act came the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and the Vocational Acts of 1963 and 1968, all of which added new dimensions to federal-state relationships.

Another significant factor affecting federal-state relationships in the 1960's was rioting which occurred in a number of cities across the country. The resulting redirection of the manpower training programs to serve the disadvantaged resulted in stresses and strains in federal-state relationships. Sixty-five percent of the MDTA trainees had to be disadvantaged. The Department of Labor was again monitoring the State Employment Service to ascertain that the disadvantaged were, in fact, being served. This is perhaps the first time that quotas were

established for clientele to be served by the Employment Service. Not only were state agencies legally directed to serve the disadvantaged, the Department of Labor was scrutinizing the racial composition of the state agencies. Administrative relationships between the federal government and the states changed when the Bureau of Employment Security was dissolved and the Manpower Administration assumed a leadership role. The state agencies' performance was more closely monitored through budget review by the Manpower Administration.

Another strain on the federal-state relationships was created when OEO entered the scene. OEO made direct grants to local sponsors and the states were bypassed. There was considerable bitterness between the State Employment Service and the local community action agencies. The situation has improved somewhat since the bulk of the manpower programs under OEO have been transferred to the Department of Labor.

Still another source of friction between the federal government and the states is the avalanche of guidelines from Washington for federal categorical manpower programs which the states administer. Moreover, budgeting has become much more complex, and agency staffs have grown. Prior to 1962, the only source of funds for administration of the Employment Service was primarily Title III of the Social Security Act. Today there is about $2.5 to $2.6 billion involved in manpower activities. This is a tenfold increase since 1962, when $250 million was available for manpower--primarily for the operation of the Employment Service. Adequate funding of the operations of the state agencies continues to be a major problem area, especially in view of the proliferation of manpower programs.

The federal-state relationships were also affected by the introduction of CAMPS, which was established by Executive Order in 1967.

This represented a Department of Labor effort to bring about some kind of coordination of manpower programs. The state was directed by the United States Department of Labor to form state CAMPS organizations. It can be debated whether CAMPS was effective. But the important point is that this was a step in the direction of bringing about coordination among the state agencies involved in the implementation and delivery of manpower services. The state agencies were brought together and they could at least talk to one another in terms of what needed to be done for the delivery of manpower services.

The proposed manpower legislation on the floor of Congress will also affect federal-state relationships. The manpower bill now before Congress is designed to coordinate the federal, state, and local governmental relationships as they relate to manpower. The proposed legislation gives the mayors of the large cities a responsibility--equal responsibility with the states--in the delivery of manpower services. I had hoped that the governors would be given greater responsibilities, since the cities are creatures of the state. CAMPS issuance 72-2 dated May 12, 1971 assigns mayors responsibilities for Manpower Planning. The issuance calls for planning councils--both at the state and local area levels. The primary task of these councils will be to advise mayors and governors on the needs of the state or area, as the case may be, the manpower services, and the establishment of priorities to meet these needs. A second task will be to assist in developing comprehensive manpower plans for the state or area which includes needs, priorities, and recommendations to be relayed to the government itself, be it state or local. The plan must provide manpower programs and goals in the following terms: 1) the

needs of the individuals for manpower services, 2) employers' needs for employable workers, and 3) delivery system of manpower services which will insure a high success rate in moving people into jobs. These are important objectives. Because we have developed in the United States what I have called the job economy, about 90 percent of the labor force is now employed. The job has become the most important economic activity in the lives of most Americans.

The issuance 72-2 provides that governors and the mayors will each develop plans for program implementations. There is to be an exchange of plans and if the problems have not been resolved, the Regional Manpower Coordinating Committee will resolve the problem. The state plan is to be comprehensive, reflecting inputs of various plans, and complementing the locally based studies. The mayor will have a responsibility for his area. Outside the large cities of 100,000 or more there will be ancillary manpower planning boards designated by the governor to cover the existing CAMPS areas. However, planning the manpower needs and services under this issuance will involve a very unusual set of relationships, namely, the governor of the state, mayors of large cities, and the federal-regional manpower coordinating committee. Since most of the manpower programs involve the U.S. Department of Labor, in all probability the Regional Manpower Administrator will play a key role in the relationship. To put it another way, the large city mayors and the governor under this issuance are now co-equal. State constitutions say that cities are creatures of the same. In this planning configuration, the Regional Manpower Administrator will be the referee. One can make the assumption that if the governor and the mayors do not agree, it will be

the Regional Manpower Administrator who, in effect, will do the planning. Instead of decentralizing manpower effort, the proposed legislation and the CAMPS issuance may have the effect of centralizing these planning efforts in the office of the Regional Manpower Administrator. In a great number of states, mayors of the big cities are not of the same political party as the governor which may create problems of implementation of CAMPS issuance 72-2.

It should be noted that the planning of manpower needs and services is essentially a political act. Planning reflects the political policy of the level of government involved. The governor, the mayor, and the Regional Manpower Administrator each has a constituency which must be served. Planning, in this context, is political and thus may not meet the needs of those for whom the services are intended. The very composition of a planning council provided in the interagency issuance reflects the political nature of planning. Membership of these councils will include agency representatives on business, labor, the public, and client groups. Reconciliations of the conflicting points of view of these groups will indeed be a challenging assignment for the Chief Executive--whether he is the governor or the mayor.

Planning by such diverse membership is more like negotiating in collective bargaining. Moreover, there is no effective mechanism for identifying the clientele group. The notion underlying the maximum people participation concept is that the clientele for the manpower services is a homogeneous group. This is not true, based on my experiences. Maximum people participation makes manpower planning much more difficult. I get the impression that the framers of the

maximum people participation concept were impressed with the idea of the New England Town meeting. The Town meeting was effective when the population was homogeneous and there was truly a sense of the community. Today, however, the population of any community is not homogeneous and the sense of the community, as I shall point out, has been severely diluted and diminished, especially in the large cities of our country.

Manpower planning for the large cities presents other problems, both technical and political. The technical question is: What constitutes an appropriate area for planning purposes? Planning would be easier if no one was permitted to enter or leave the city in search of employment, This, of course, is ridiculous. Individuals can and do travel 30, 40, or 50 miles each day to get to work. The interstate highway system has facilitated the mobility of workers. It has made it easier for workers to travel to the job. Moreover, the improved highway system has expanded the geographical boundaries of the labor market. Because of vast improvements in the highway systems, workers can live in one city and commute 20, 30, 40, 50 miles to work in about the same length of time it takes to cross the city, making commuting widespread.

Earlier I said that the sense of the community has been distorted, diluted, and greatly diminished. This is due largely to the fact that we have created a dichotomy between place of work and place of residence. Once upon a time, a factory was built and the neighborhood grew around the factory. Workers lived and worked in the same community, but today workers live in one place and work in another. This has not only weakened the sense of the community but has also created a technical problem in planning.

There are other political problems involved in planning, especially in large local labor market areas. Permit me to use Detroit as an example. In metropolitan Detroit, there are 36 local governmental units, each of which zealously guards its identity. Many of the jobs that were once in the central city have been moved to the suburbs. However, in many instances, people who need manpower services the most live in the central city where there are a limited number of jobs available. It is my impression that, in many instances, the relationship between the mayor of the big city and mayor of suburban cities in a given area is not one of cooperation.

There appear to be suspicions and ill will between the mayor of the big city and the mayors of the suburban cities. Another political problem is the structure of local governmental units. Many cities have a city manager type of government, as is the case in Des Moines. CAMPS Issuance 72-2 does not mention the role of the city manager. In some cities, the mayor is not a full time job. The city manager, on the other hand, is an employee who is accountable to the city council and not to the citizens of the area.

There is another problem in planning. Planning for manpower services suffers in the United States because of scarce financial resources. Planning must be directed toward some objective to which the nation has committed itself. The Employment Act of 1946 provides that objective--namely, full employment. Resources have not been provided by the Congress to achieve that objective. The proposed legislation and the interagency issuance direct state and local government units to plan. The plans developed will be used for the basis of funding. Funds,

however, are limited and, at best, the plans will be partially funded. Consequently, priorities for services should be established. Setting of priorities is not simple, especially for politicians who must stand for reelection. Assume for a moment that a city has a very high rate of unemployment. There are many heads of households who are unemployed, and there is also a very high unemployment rate among the youth. Question: Who will be served--heads of households or the young adult? Who will make this decision? How will priorities be established?

I was in Houston, Texas, this spring and visited the Houston Job Fair, which was a great experience. Five thousand disadvantaged youngsters in the Houston area registered for jobs. I was talking to one of the coordinators and he told me that they only had 2,200 jobs for 5,000 youth. So I asked a rather naive question: Who is going to tell the other 2,800 people that there are no jobs even though they were urged by the Job Fair personnel to register? The coordinator just shrugged his shoulders.

There has already been some experience in Manpower Planning. Employment Service personnel have been required in recent years to develop plans of service. In theory, the local offices prepared their plans which, in turn, were reviewed at the state level. The state agency, in theory, developed its plans based on inputs from the local offices. The state plans were sent to the Regional Manpower Administration and then on to Washington. Exactly what happened to the plans is not clear. From my observations, the efforts and energies expended were not rewarded.

In summary, the relationships between the U. S. Department of Labor and the states could be improved significantly if the states were more involved. The Manpower Administration develops policies, guidelines and allocates the funds. The state agencies implement the programs and provide the manpower services. The Manpower Administration then evaluates performance of the states through budget review. My point is that the states are directed to implement programs in which they have had little or no influence. Of course, the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies is involved, but it is difficult to assess its inputs.

The planning function is replete with both technical and political problems. This is not to say that we should not be planning. Of course, even with all the limitations, we must move forward in developing the necessary skills for manpower planning. These technical problems and political problems will never be fully resolved.

In my view, the states should assume a more effective leadership role in manpower. The governor is the Chief Executive and is accountable to all citizens of the state. If we are to have states, they should be used more effectively to serve their residents. There is also a critical need for a close partnership between the state and its local governmental units. By working closely, the citizens of the state can best be served by and through the manpower programs.

CHAPTER 4

CHARACTERISTICS OF A GOOD MANPOWER PLAN

Neal Hadsell*

I am extremely pleased to have this opportunity to participate in this important conference.

One hears more and more about Manpower Planning these days. As a matter of fact, there seems to be more attention being given to the subject, v.z.:

> A national conference on state and local manpower planning in Salt Lake City in April of this year--
>
> A recent seminar of local manpower planners last month in Louisville, Kentucky, sponsored by the conference of mayors and national league of cities.

And then, of course, this meeting, which has an impressive agenda, and of a size which will probably produce some usable, practical information for all of us.

Since World War II, and particularly during the decade of the 60's, we have seen and experienced some dramatic changes in the field of manpower. The decade of the 70's will provide more of the same, and perhaps even change that some will classify as revolutionary.

In this country, little attention was given to the field of manpower until the late 50's or early 60's.

---

*Deputy Regional Manpower Administrator, U. S. Department of Labor, Kansas City, Missouri.

So for the first time, we had a beginning effort for Manpower Planning in that, at least some people were attempting to identify some of the challenges and predicted changes that would come about due to certain economic and social factors.

As a result of these efforts, congress responded in the 60's by providing resources to assist in meeting the needs of people and, in particular, workers affected by the changes through legislation such as ARA, MDTA, EOA and amendments to the Social Security Act.

And now, as we move into the 70's, more legislation is being considered in the form of revenue sharing, reorganization of the federal government, new manpower legislation, public service employment, welfare reform, etc. In addition, the administration is taking steps to transfer authority to state and local governments for the administration and operation of certain people programs.

With these approaching changes, it behooves those of us in government--local, state and federal--to get our houses in order if we are to be prepared to carry out our responsibilities. A brief look back at the changes in manpower during the 60's should indicate the need for more and better planning.

You will recall we have been concerned with a wide range of problems caused by change. Starting with emerging economically depressed areas,

> To concern for opening opportunities for persons disadvantaged by technological change;
>
> To aid for disadvantaged workers who were not participating in the job market, but could not take advantage of training even during the longest period of economic growth this country has experienced;

To concentrated efforts to assist individuals in special poverty infected areas of our major cities;

To the involvement of the business sector, specifically NAB;

And more recently, to the effects of a major shift in the national budget from defense to domestic activities.

While it is true we may not have been able to plan for all of these changes, a good planning base would have assisted us in working on the problems.

The 70's will be even more complicated, and already we are experiencing some of these problems in the form of rising welfare rolls, displaced engineers, scientists and technicians, unemployed veterans, and a paucity of job opportunities for all workers. The disturbing job plight of this year's college graduating class points up a whole new range of problems. This was highlighted in Time magazine's May 24, 1971 issue which reported some experts argue that the U.S. has become an overtrained society, producing too many specialists for too few jobs. It also indicates 80% of all jobs available in the U.S. are within the capabilities of those with high school diplomas and that 25% of all college graduates will be working at jobs for which a college education is not needed at all. Whether you agree or not, this information is food for thought.

Having been in manpower for some time, I will say that our greatest weakness and deficiency has been, and still is, in the area of planning. Additionally, I feel strongly that we have not done too well with available resources, and this is perhaps due to inadequate planning and coordination. In other words, I have seen little evidence of effective and meaningful planning.

Planning is a very fashionable term and is widely used in government, but in my judgment, poorly performed. Every agency and organization has planning bodies and advisory boards that prepare plans. Very little coordination is accomplished in the plan preparation and once prepared--which is generally for specific funding purposes--the document usually goes on a shelf until the next one is due. More often than not, it does not have the input of appropriate people and affected organizations. It seems to me this applies in general to all of our public programs. So this is why I think a meeting of this nature is so important.

This all leads me to my assignment and that is the "Characteristics of a Good Manpower Plan."

However, before I get very far, I want to preface my remarks with the statement that I place more importance on the use of the plan than on the contents. I hope this matter will be treated in other parts of this conference and I am sure it will.

To my knowledge, there really is no good model for Manpower Planning in government and for the most part, very few good guidelines. In some respects, this may be good, because I feel a good plan is one that is developed by local people for local needs. Since there are so many variables, there is always a danger--and it's the easiest approach--of attempting to make a model fit all situations. This is just not good enough for today's complex problems. I will admit, however, we do need guidelines to insure the uniformity necessary for coordination, integration, and wide utilization.

To set the record straight, I want to make it clear now that I am not attempting to provide you with a model today. However, there are

certain ingredients that are essential to a manpower plan, and I will share my views on this with you.

In manpower, we have made a start through CAMPS--Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System.

In terms of real planning, my experience with CAMPS in two federal regional offices involving 16 states forces me to conclude that we haven't yet done too well in our planning. However, the CAMPS effort was a start and at least it did, for the first time, provide a forum for interested organizations to discuss common problems and exchange program information. There have also been examples of the development of program linkages which would probably not have otherwise occurred. Notwithstanding what I have said, CAMPS plans have, in general, improved each year.

In an effort to strengthen CAMPS, the Department of Labor has made grants to mayors and governors to hire full-time staff members to organize, develop and administer the manpower planning process.

This was a first step toward improving CAMPS, as it was discovered very early the organization needed some full-time staff to be able to get the necessary inputs of all manpower and manpower related organizations. This is perhaps the only way one can insure continuity of input. Full-time, competent staff support is an absolute must for a good manpower plan. Without this support, the plan will probably not be developed, operated and monitored.

In developing a good manpower plan, an early decision has to be made as to what kind of plan will be considered--one that will be used to take advantage of the available federal dollars or a comprehensive manpower plan that will truly serve the total needs of the community.

It seems to me we should consider both purposes. Certainly, under today's economic and social conditions, the development of a plan to use allocated fiscal year resources is just not enough. Since the title of this conference is "Comprehensive Manpower Planning," this obviously is the concern of those of us gathered here today.

Generally speaking, in any effort to improve, you have to start by working with what you have. In this case, it is CAMPS. As you know, we do have a new CAMPS interagency issuance which not only changes the name to Manpower Planning Councils but also provides for a broader and perhaps more appropriate membership. In my judgment, the CAMPS issuances provide a good guideline and with a conscientious application, it can serve the areas and states well.

Before getting into the actual preparation of a manpower plan, the purpose must be defined and understood by those who are participating in the process.

CHARACTERISTICS OF A GOOD PLAN

It would be a little difficult to spell out all of the necessary elements of a good plan, but there are certain processes and general basic information that would be necessary to the development of a manpower plan.

Even at the risk of overlooking some important aspects, I would like to suggest several conditions that I think a plan should meet. A plan must:

1. be viable--A plan should consider an immediate period, but also a longer period of time, possibly 3-5 years: it should cover changing conditions and still have the ability to be updated frequently. In other words, the plan is a

"living" or "continuing" process. It should be a regular part of program development and administration.

2. be flexible--The plan must be capable of being changed to adapt to the unexpected, either improving or deteriorating conditions: one that will permit a reconsideration of the utilization of resources.

3. be realistic--There must be some reasonable expectation that goals can be achieved. It should not be short of what is possible, nor overly ambitious. However, specific problems should be identified even though there is little expectation that resources are currently available.

4. be comprehensive--The plan must include all manpower and manpower related activities. It cannot be effective if it deals only with programs administered by the Department of Labor. It should include the total universe of needs and total available resources. A good plan will also attempt to identify the source of the problem, rather than always dealing with remedial action.

5. be efficient--Rationale for planning should be efficiently summarized in the plan. This requires all appropriate input in the plan development and active staff performance in operation and

evaluation. The format should be complete, simple, and easily understood. There must be competent and dedicated people involved in the total procedure.

6. be accurate--All data in the plan should be as accurate as possible. The data used must be the best available in the area. The accuracy of the plan and overall quality, of course, will be governed by the quality of the data going into the planning process.

7. be coordinated--A good plan will include procedures of manpower services to the fullest extent possible with similar services offered by other public and private agencies under other statutory authority.

8. consider critical environment factors--A good plan must include an assessment of:

   (a) Structure and level of economic activity;

   (b) Seriousness of social problems;

   (c) Ability of local and state institutions and community agencies to participate in manpower programs.

9. identify resources--Local, state and federal. Include input from employers, employer organizations, managers, labor and education.

10. set priorities--A measurement system that reveals performance, or how well the plan serves the

community needs is the test. This, of course, is probably the most difficult area of the process.

I realize the above is not all-inclusive, but it does represent most of the important elements.

Technically speaking, a good manpower plan should provide the socio-economic and administrative background for planning fiscal year activities and even beyond.

Within this frame of reference, I am talking about:

(1) Existing economic conditions and anticipated developments. This includes such items as:

(a) Labor force characteristics;

(b) Economic indicators--retail sales, construction, etc.;

(c) Labor supply and demands--job openings, demands, wages, etc.; new entrants and re-entrants.

(2) Identification of target population:

(a) Total population;

(b) Unemployed and underemployed;

(c) Income distribution;

(d) Education;

(e) Welfare status;

(f) Medical and health factors;

(g) Transportation;

(h) Day care needs and facilities.

Then, of course, the plan is to reflect the actual operations that are proposed to meet the manpower needs and problems that are

identified. Normally this will deal with the available or anticipated budgetary resources.

As we plan, we should keep three broad targets before us:

(1) Individual groups within the population with markedly high rates of unemployment (disadvantaged teenagers, ghetto residents, rural poor).

(2) The development of greater supplies of labor where acute shortages exist or can be foreseen.

(3) More efficient function of the labor market--(computerize activities).

As I indicated in the beginning, there really is no manpower planning model. It would be folly for me to represent what I have said today to be a blueprint for a perfect plan. I will, however, submit to you that the ingredients for a good plan are generally available to you. The challenge, of course, is how do we get it all together, put it in an orderly form, develop a work plan and then work the plan.

We have many manpower problems today, and they will probably get worse before they get better. At the same time, I think we are better prepared than ever before to cope with them. People are concerned and resources are being made available.

Your job and mine is to make the most effective utilization of our resources--both human and monetary. Most of us here have considerable experience in the field of manpower. In my judgment, we can be effective only if we plan our activities. Admittedly--manpower planning is a difficult process and is relatively new, and very few people possess the skill and techniques to make it work. But just think of the benefits that would redound to a state or local area if there existed an ongoing

effective manpower plan. In these difficult and complicated times, we cannot afford to be without one.

Hopefully, this conference will in some small way point us in the right direction--I think it will.

CHAPTER 5

MANPOWER PLANNING AT THE STATE LEVEL: PANEL DISCUSSION

A. STATE EMPLOYMENT SECURITY COMMISSION

George Lundberg*

In many ways, I guess you could call me a typical American. Like most of my fellow Americans, the scope and extent of our nation's manpower problems were pretty much unknown to me when the Sixties began. Over the years, the scars of the Depression had healed, World War II had faded into the past and I was intent on my family, my job and my special interests.

But, like many other Americans, the Sixties demonstrated to me in rapid progression that the world does move on while social progress lags behind.

Like other Americans, I could no longer ignore some serious problems existing within my own country--poverty, discrimination, wasted lives, riots, rising welfare costs, communities dying from lack of economic growth, cities facing an unsure future at best. The more I heard, the more my concern grew. The problems seemed to multiply but the solutions seemed too far off in the future. I also had to learn to accept the uncomfortable fact that these problems existed in my own state--not in just the ghettos of major cities or in the rural areas of the South.

---

*Chairman, Iowa Employment Security Commission

During the same period, I began hearing of new government programs. Most of them became a confusing tangle of alphabet soup. The supporters of these programs said one thing, the critics another.

Then, in June, 1969 I was appointed to the Iowa Employment Security Commission. At the time, I must admit I thought it was a rather simple agency with a rather well-defined role. Was I ever wrong--and I am still learning how wrong one can be. I'd like to tell you a little bit about this agency for it directly ties in with manpower planning at the state level yesterday, today and tomorrow.

As you know, the Iowa Employment Security Commission (IESC) was born in the middle of the Great Depression. Its major goals were to administer the unemployment insurance program and to match workers with whatever jobs were available. As a new agency, it started off from scratch besieged with all of the problems facing any new organization plus the added complication of a very unhealthy, to say the least, economy. Working on orange crates with few procedures and few guidelines, these new recruits to a new untested program did a job to be proud of. Then, without time to catch a breath, the agency was faced with a new challenge--filling the manpower needs of a nation faced with its greatest war ever. Again the challenge was met.

After the war, the nation gradually slipped back into peace time living. With the country and its people intent on making up for the loss of time of the Depression and War Years, the IESC gradually receded into the background. It still carried out its major roles of matching people with jobs and paying unemployment insurance. And in

carrying out this mission, it tried in various ways to help those who had special problems. But with little public knowledge and with resulting small public interest in the job problems faced by many Americans, the agency's staff and other resources were totally insufficient to effectively develop and carry out problems. Usually, outside community resources were also nonexistent. When trying to help a person who lacked job skills, our staff frequently ran into deadends. We had no training to offer, the person had no financial resources and other agencies were unable to help because they, too, lacked resources.

However, there were bright spots. Frequently our staff, other agencies and employers unofficially worked out special help for an individual with a job problem. Often, in these cases, each donated their own personal time and sometimes even money to help someone out.

But many of the old manpower problems were left virtually untouched and what's more, they continued to grow.

The people within our agency were aware of some of the problems. However, there were little or no resources to find out even basic information about the size or scope of our manpower problems or to provide in-depth help to individuals once we discovered what their problems were.

With the advent of the Sixties, the manpower problems of the nation gained attention and the number of manpower programs multiplied. When a nation and an agency set out to solve such complex problems as manpower, the first few years are bound to be ones of experimentation and exploration. The answers are never simple and the progress is never as rapid as we would prefer. The adjustments are never easy.

The bugs in new programs must be worked out, the public and legislators must consider a multitude of choices and the people within various other levels of government must do a great deal of realignment. The Sixties were not comfortable years of dealing with manpower problems. This disruption of "normalcy" was, I think, their greatest contribution to all of us. In trying to solve problems that were too long neglected, we began to learn. Now, in the decade of the Seventies, we must take the knowledge and experience we have gained, build on it, and quicken the pace of truly meeting the needs of the people whose potential is not being utilized.

One of the most important things that we learned during the Sixties was that good manpower planning can not be done at any level without good manpower information. We also learned that despite the volumes of statistics collected by government agencies and others there were many important areas where we had little, if any, reliable information.

If we are honest with ourselves today--and I believe we must be--we are still a long way from having this data. We have a better idea of what information we will need but unless we agree to make manpower information a major priority among all of us, we will never have even the bare minimum of information we need for basic manpower planning.

The Commission intends to give new emphasis to manpower information within our own agency. It must be one of our primary goals. It will also be one of our most difficult goals to accomplish. Let me review our research situation to point out how much needs to be done.

Currently we do not have past or current workforce data for almost two-thirds of our Iowa counties. These data are the backbone

for developing all other manpower data. These data must be collected and available for at least a 4-year period before it can be used by local government units to qualify for special federal funds. Since these data are not available, many Iowa counties are probably missing out on these grants to which they are entitled.

The research staff in our agency knows how to collect these data and the complicated procedure of developing these materials is not our major handicap. The major handicap is lack of qualified personnel and data processing capacity. To develop and keep these data on a current basis, we would need at least eight more research specialists stationed in various parts of the state plus more back-up help in the administrative office. We do not have the money to hire this personnel. And we are also faced with a special manpower problem of our own. Because of the current pay scale and lack of advancement opportunity, we cannot attract and keep the kind of research personnel we need. Among our researchers out in the field, at the present time, the senior one has two years of experience. Since the collection of manpower data is a speciality of its own, we have found that normally it takes at least two years before a local economist is functioning at full capacity. At the rate we are losing researchers, they are gone even before they are trained.

If this were our only research problem, I would be more than happy. But there are many more. For over a year we have been trying to implement the Employment Service Automated Reporting System or ESARS. Eventually this system should provide us with much information on the people who come to us for job help. When fully operational, it will

generate some 2000 reports. At the present time, however, it is creating a mountain of paper work. We have six people working on this project out of necessity but we are only budgeted for two persons. Without better data processing capacity and without better staffing, we will be snowed under with data that we will not have the capability to analyze. As we have learned, the collection of data is only the first step. It must also be properly evaluated and then disseminated to people such as you who need it for decision making.

Eventually the ESARS system will also be tied in with our new cost accounting system. The ultimate result will give us a much more accurate picture of the real costs of carrying out each of our services. As a result, we will have a better picture of what resources will be needed when we are asked to develop or expand services.

Another future source of valuable data will come as a result of the extension of unemployment insurance coverage to employers with one or more employees. This data will help expand our knowledge of the employment structure of our state. Hopefully we will be able to have this data on a county-by-county basis. At the present time, we are one of the few states that does not have its covered employment broken down on a county basis. Again, the big hangup is lack of staff and data processing capacity.

In just the last year, our agency has started to collect job vacancy information. This information can be a valuable tool in predicting growing and declining job fields.

Last year, our agency also opened its first Job Bank in Des Moines. During the coming year, the Job Bank system will be expanded

to several other areas. Job Bank must be considered the prelude to job matching which should come in the near future. Besides allowing for the faster matching of people and jobs which will benefit both the employer and the job seeker, this system will also be a valuable information component. With trained staff, this data can be used to find out more about the characteristics of job openings and help us keep more in tune with the continuous changes in our complex, ever-moving job market.

These research programs I have mentioned are only a few of the many that are in their beginnings. But even these small beginnings are important because we are on the threshold of really getting to know about manpower at the local level. Somehow within our own agency and within other concerned groups we must overcome the current roadblocks to getting these data. If manpower is truly one of our commitments, then the development of manpower information must also be one of our commitments.

At the same time, we must see that manpower services are delivered now to the people who need them now. We cannot let valuable human resources lay idle while we regroup to help them at some later time.

Again we have made beginnings but we have far to go. We have slowly learned that we cannot stay in our offices and wait for employers, those in need of help, or the community to come to us. We have started to reach out to the community. We are trying to see beyond our own agency and are trying to become more of a working partner with others involved in manpower. In many cases, this has resulted in changes within our own organization. For example, we recently reorganized the administrative areas of our local offices so that they would coincide with the

governor's economic areas. This should result in better planning all around and the collection of data based on these boundaries.

We are constantly taking another look at our services and our programs to try to honestly see what they are accomplishing not just in terms of so-much paper generated but in terms of what they are doing to really help the individual who needs help. We are trying to take the labels off the groups of people we need to help and to recognize them as individuals in need of individualized services.

We are recognizing that we cannot do our best for our clients until we also aid our own employees to have greater insight and understanding of the person they are trying to help.

We have come out of the Sixties with many programs designed to solve many problems. We now have the painful task of really looking at these programs and determining which ones have the greatest potential of really accomplishing something in the Seventies. We must keep looking at each and every one of our services with a critical eye and we must make constructive changes when we see the need for change. We must no longer do something this year just because we did it that way last year.

Perhaps our greatest challenge will be to point out our inadequacies and to yell for your help and assistance. We know that we are only one small segment of the manpower picture. Our contribution will only be as good as our working relationship with the world outside our doors. As we learn more about manpower, as we see changes in the job market, and as we find solutions to manpower problems we must share them with all of you.

We also have the obligation of sharing this information with the public so that job seekers, employers, communities--the whole spectrum of our people--will have the best possible information on which to make their decisions.

Yet we must go a step further. Our agency must push on to the point where we are truly a complete manpower service organization that is responsive to the needs and changes within our state. We must be in complete tune with those we exist to serve. Our service must be so well-rounded that we can serve each and every Iowa citizen. We must gain the knowledge and expertise so that we can adequately evaluate the individual's present and potential abilities in relation to his entire life situation and to the changing job market. We must then be able to tell him what various alternatives exist for him. When the individual has determined what his goal is, we must assist him in every way we can to reach this goal. To do this, we will need to strengthen our own delivery potential but we will also need the help of many other agencies and organizations. To fully deserve the name of a complete manpower service, this service must be available to those with the greatest expectations and to those with little or no expectations at all. This country and this state can not afford the waste of any of its human resources merely because the individual does not fit into a certain category.

At the same time, we will only be a complete manpower service when we have the capacity to provide the employer with the qualified manpower he needs. We must make every effort to understand and work with the employer in solving his manpower problems. Yet, at the same time we are providing him with qualified manpower, we must also turn to him

for his active cooperation in developing potential manpower. We already see the start of this cooperation in the on-the-job training program and other programs. We must also make sure that we provide the employer with the economic and manpower information he needs so that he can plan for the future.

When we have met these needs of the employer and the worker, we will then deserve the name of a complete, responsive manpower agency and we will also find growing public support of our programs.

As chairman of the Iowa Employment Security Commission, I know that we face many challenges in reaching these goals. But we are committed to these goals and we will make every effort to reach them.

I promise you today that we stand ready to provide you with the manpower information we have already collected and we will make the improvement of our manpower information a major priority. I promise you that our agency will take the steps it must, to become a responsive, complete manpower service geared to meet the needs of all citizens, the business community and our state.

I ask you to help us in every way you can. Together, we can achieve another giant step for mankind.

MANPOWER PLANNING AT THE STATE LEVEL: PANEL DISCUSSION

B. DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Chad Wymer*

The items I want to discuss include the new industry, industrial location, employment opportunities, the consideration of the new and the expanding industry within the state and its relationship to the work force available, respective skill levels, the needs that we see (the training needs), the economic goals, and growth. I will relate this, of course, to our manpower agencies.

First of all, I'd like to mention that our role is more than a singular role in industrial development. Our concern is basically in four areas. We talk about creating job opportunity -- probably industrial opportunity is one of the most discussed because we've seen very rapid growth in job opportunities in the state in this area in the past decade. However, we have had growth in job opportunities in the tourist industry -- a service industry. In other words, our role in promoting tourism, encouraging people to travel and visit our state, certainly creates job opportunities. We have seen good growth in this area, especially in the last five-year period.

Certainly we are also concerned with the area of agriculture from the standpoint of the loss of jobs that we have witnessed during

---

*Director of Iowa Development Commission

the past years. We are concerned about our job opportunities in the agricultural product promotion area. Hopefully, we can do those things which would cause some leveling of the decline in agricultural employment. Then, of course, we must utilize agriculture the best we can to create any employment within the processing or manufacturing type industry.

Another area is commercial development. We realize that the Iowa Development Commission hasn't really been involved in what we would call "commercial development." If we are successful in creating activity where there is money flow--industrial activity, job opportunity--and there are new recreational opportunities, then there is going to be commercial activity from the standpoint of even the service station, the motel operation, etc. We feel that this is good employment, and it is good for our state to see this balance of industrial and service development taking place.

As we look at development from the IDC viewpoint, and as we discuss it in staff meetings, we constantly realize that there is a need within the state for better coordination among agencies and groups. A better coordinated effort is needed in producing the meaningful manpower information. Many times I have found that we have several agencies or several groups trying to accomplish the same thing, and we need to come together in our efforts and our work to make that manpower knowledge or the information about the manpower availability more meaningful. I still maintain that there needs to be one agency assigned to manpower information, with all others working very closely to support this agency. When a company seeks a plant location, one of the key factors in consideration by that company is, of course, the manpower available in the area. Are the skills available? Are people available

who can be trained? Are the training facilities available? Certainly the wage factor is considered by any company considering a move to an area.

In early 1970, our research department began to receive census figures and take a look at what we really have to do in this state to provide opportunities--job opportunities--for our people. Certainly we have heard the cry that we don't want to grow, we don't want to see a lot of people moving into our state, etc., but this wasn't really our concern. Our major concern was to provide job opportunities for Iowans. We know that during the past ten years we had not maintained job opportunities in this state for the people who were born in this state. Out migration had taken place. Therefore, we began to project. In the next ten-year period there will be a need to have jobs available for some 49 thousand people who will be coming off the farms and have agricultural employment. Literally, 118 thousand people will be graduating from our high schools and colleges and entering the work force. We project that we have a need here again for 167 thousand job opportunities in the next ten-year period. The fact is that we have not met those of any one for over the past ten years; and we have, therefore, got a big job to do.

At our national ad campaign this past year, we talked about a man who will work an hour for an hour's pay. We talked about the man who was intelligent, who was easy to train, and the dedication of the individual--of Iowans. We find that our turnover rate in Iowa is less; we find that the Iowan produces at the rate of 14.5% above the national average; and we find that he produces $1500 per year more than the national average.

In order to prove this, we certainly weigh very heavily on everybody that is involved in this ballgame to assist us, to vocational technical schools, and others, in accomplishing this role. The people in the field whom we can call upon for help are very important to us.

Let's take a look at what's happened in Iowa in the past ten-year period. During this period of time we have experienced some 85,497 jobs, created by manufacturing operations--industrial opportunities. This is a new industry created by a company that did not exist anywhere else before starting new in Iowa. Branch plant locations of a company which is located elsewhere, usually out of the state of Iowa but sometimes in the state of Iowa, means the company is building a plant in a city within Iowa. Expansion is when a company here is expanding, and certainly we would like to see more activity because we are assisting these people in their expansion areas. Here again, as we talk about manpower training and helping people with their manpower needs, we can assist companies in expanding their industries by showing them what we can do to train people which will help them meet their needs. During that ten-year period, there was invested by industry in the state of Iowa $1,735,810,000. Certainly you can see the shift that is taking place. This investment certainly creates a tax base for other needs. Certainly job opportunities can be created this way. Tax problems can be solved by creating investment capitol and keeping people fully employed.

Since the first of December, we noted a definite increase in the employer level activity, which we call qualified projects or prospects--people that we qualify, that are legitimate, or who have the will

to go about locating a plant and are interested in the location possibility in Iowa or some other state. We don't always end up terribly contented with these plant locations, but we note a trend taking place that we feel is great--although some of my urban friends will disagree with this trend. I think the emphasis that is taking place in the federal government on rural development has caused this somewhat; but we are also, maybe for the first time in many years, feeding this realization within the industrialist today that rural Iowa, rural America, is good and that these communities in rural Iowa can support industry and have been doing it for years. We can say that we have the ability to train people in our state; we have the available work force in our state; and we have the transportation system to serve. In fact, I can thank the former chairman of the board of the 3M Company when he said when questioned, "Why did you locate your facility and ask for a location of a plant in Knoxville, Iowa? It is a small community. Why that size of a facility there?" His comment was, "Well, first of all the people wanted me. Secondly, the people there wanted to work, were willing to work. Third of all, I can make a profit there." This is the trend that we are noticing taking place in America today right here in Iowa. The majority of our new plant locations are taking place in what we classify as rural Iowa. The Des Moines people, and certainly the metropolitan areas of Council Bluffs, Davenport, etc., are quite concerned about this; and so are we. However, I think it is the way of life that the people are seeking. The trend shows us--let's look at 1970--that communities classified over twenty-five thousand had forty percent of our total plant locations last year--expansions, locations, etc. Only twenty-five percent, though, of the branch plant

locations went into communities of that size. Only twenty-two percent of the new industry starts went into communities over twenty-five thousand, and we don't classify anything under that as urban. The communities with the classification of ten thousand to twenty-five thousand had nineteen percent of the branch plants, eight percent of the new industries, and eight percent of the expansions. Communities in the five thousand to ten thousand category had twenty-eight percent of the branch plants and nineteen percent of the new industry. Here's a good one for you. In the one thousand to five thousand population communities (711 communities in our state are in that category), we had six percent of the branch plants, no new industry starts, and three percent of the expansion. Recently I testified before Senator Humphrey's subcommittee on rural development. They asked me to talk about national rural policy and the trends that we saw in our state of national rural policy for communities of ten thousand to fifty thousand. My point to them was, "Gentlemen, that isn't my major concern in this state. My major concern is in those communities from one thousand to fifty thousand population range or one thousand to ten thousand, of which we have some 229. My concern is also for those below one thousand who do have a possibility for growth." Certainly we know that not all of them can support industry but certainly we realize that most of them are located in a region or area near a main city or a large enough city that can support industry in which the people living in that area, or would want to reside in that area, can benefit from.

We involve ourselves in attempting to determine what industry looks for and the type of information they look for on the employment, the earnings, and the population and the characteristics of the area.

First of all, of course, in the work force of the area they are looking at the male and female population of fourteen years and older that are employed. They look at the total labor force--female and male. They look at the percent of the labor force that is unemployed--male and female. They look at the employees on non-agricultural payroll by industrial division, the present distribution of the labor force by sex and color, the earnings of production workers by industry divisions or groups of industries, and the high and the low average hourly wage rates by job title. I want to talk about that a little later because it is very important. There are times that we feel we have lost because we only had an average hourly wage shown for the total community or the total area or region, and it scares them off. We don't have the information that they really need. They look for the listing of industries including the seasonal employment, the commuting distance by employers of the industrial sector, the identification of the vocational training facilities in the area, the records, the identification of fringe benefits of major companies, such as the pension plan, vacations, overtime, holidays, and the employment turnover and absentee rate.

Whether looking at the population data, the labor force characteristics, data on agriculture manpower, farm opportunities, or farm labor requirements, it is important to compare them on a state-wide basis.

Many times we see surveys being made to train people. I personally think that maybe we don't want to adapt enough to the fact that we may be training people when there are not jobs available. I'd like to see us be a little bit more thorough and to begin to analyze the training skills needs of the region or the area. I think we will find

industry and business cooperating with us. We should use the expertise of the Employment Security Commission to determine what skill needs of people are and to attempt to train people in that area alone and not to produce people that we are going to be shipping out of this state. We need to be able to sit down with, in our case, a person who would be working with a new industry, with the vocational-technical people, the training people, and to be able to show them what we have to offer. We feel that in the state today we need to inform the industrialist and the manufacturer--and any new industry that is coming into the state--of the training programs that are available for him today--the on-the-job training, the NABS program. I don't think the program is being used in the state because I don't think we are doing a job selling, of getting in and penetrating, which is my total point. I can go back to my days in the Chamber of Commerce. We worked diligently to keep our manufacturers and our employers in that community aware and totally aware--by tours or anything we could do--and to make them knowledgeable of what training was available for them to assist them in fulfilling the job opportunities in especially those areas in which it is hard to find employees today. I think we need to do more of this constantly.

Another of the areas I mentioned previously is turnover rate. Again I know that maybe we are limited in what we can do here; but as we develop data and information, we must use it to attract employment or employers into the state. We need that kind of input to assist us. If we can gain this type of work or knowledge, then certainly we are going to be able to do a better job.

Another area of concern to me has been the regional data available. I don't feel that we have enough detailed information today

on the regional basis in this state as to the employment, the skills, and the wage rate--the breakdown situation of average low and average high by skills. This data, again in the regional small rural communities, is not available to us as we need it. We can use the 16 multi-county areas over the state as regions. Then if we do define growth centers, the data working around these growth centers within each of these regions might help us even more than it does today. I think you and I know it varies throughout the areas and throughout the state. We would like to have a little more detail than we have received in the past or have been able to develop in the past instead of shooting out a figure from our office on the average hourly wage rate in Iowa regardless of skill level.

In summary, I'll touch just one other area--agriculture. Naturally because of the advancements we have had in the agricultural technology, we know it requires more skill. We need to work closely with the agricultural industry today in regards to the farm labor situation because it is increasingly more difficult to obtain farm labor. I realize that low prices or the low hourly wage rate has something to do with it. I think we constantly need to work with this problem in training these people in certain areas because there is training needed more and more today in farm labor

We are also looking at the recreational area and checking on it because of the growth we have had in this area. Today we have approximately eighty-seven thousand or eighty-eight thousand people employed in this industry in the state. We need more specifics about this employment, about the regions in which these people are employed, the work data, and specifics about the types of people employed in this area.

The Iowa Development Commission is looking at the population data, including population characteristics. We are looking at the total work force by area in the regional concept and at characteristics--a breakdown of them. We are looking at the gross hours and the earnings of production workers on manufacturing payrolls by industrial divisions or groups of industries. We are looking at the employees on agricultural and non-agricultural payrolls by industrial division. We need more data on labor turnover rates, the employee availability by area to include such items as commuting distance, union affiliation, fringe benefits, identification of vocational-technical facilities in the area. Of course, it all boils down to the fact that we very definitely need total knowledge of all of the manpower needs within our state.

A SURVEY OF MANPOWER PLANNING AT THE STATE LEVEL: PANEL DISCUSSION

C. VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Dr. Kenneth M. Wold*

I represent the vocational education group in the state of Iowa. The topic is vocational training and occupational needs. I specifically stress "vocational" because I'd like to bring out a point with which you may or may not be acquainted. It appears that within the past year to year and a half things have been happening in the United States and in our state of Iowa relative to a little different concept than vocational education, as such, is known today. This concept is the career structure, comprised of three groups. First, there is the individual who needs the orientation as he comes up from kindergarten through elementary school into high school and then to post high school or to work. Next is the individual who will build upon his orientation relative to the development of skills. Then there are people who are already employed, who need additional work to upgrade themselves, or perhaps because of advancing technology, need retraining.

This concept is a different ballgame because we are talking now about career education starting at the kindergarten level and moving up through high school and beyond always with the thought that there is a possibility that a man finds a way of obtaining further education and

---

*Chief of Planning and Support Services, Department of Public Instruction.

using the best of his abilities to move forward to serve himself as well as society. I just came from a meeting in Kansas City which was concerned with this very subject. It is coming fast; and either vocational education is going to be doing something about it or it will be wrested out of their hands. You can be assured that in Iowa we plan to do something about it.

I would like to review with you a model which we have put together in the Department of Public Instruction to reflect those things which we are doing and what we are planning to do with the planning process. This is not a high level economics presentation, but it is the level at which we are working in an effort to get information that we need to do the job of planning and to meet the needs of employers and individual students. This is an Iowa Manpower Needs Assessment Model.* First, we need goals--"How do we know where we are going and whether or not we have arrived if we do get there?" Then comes the statement that the identification--the measurement of manpower needs--must be accomplished before effective evaluation of career education programs can be implemented. This includes not only programs in operation but also consideration of those programs that might be offered to meet the needs of employers as well as individuals.

There are four components to our model. The first component is a statewide labor demand survey which will give us information relative to employers' needs. I know there are many who feel that projections, as opposed to surveys, is the best way. A second component is a statewide labor supply analysis. This includes public and private training output and available work seekers. An analysis would necessitate cooperative efforts on the statewide basis, not only at the state

*See attached model at the end of this section.

level but also in terms of working with various schools in the communities of our state. This includes agencies such as the Employment Security Commission and the Iowa Development Commission. The third component is student needs--occupational preferences--and we are trying to respond to the needs of an individual. Two things that we seem to forget as we move down the road in our training programs are attitudes and desires. Only in knowing the student and what his needs are in conjunction with his own personal skill, personal background, ability, possibilities, and potential, can we really do the job for him and society. Last, but not least, is career education student followup where we take a look at the outcomes of training programs. "What are we accomplishing?" These are the four components of the model which I will review more specifically with you.

First of all, we need to develop an employer inventory. It's really interesting how many employers there are in Iowa. Can't we use a directory of these employers? We may think this is a simple task, but I can assure you, from personal experience, that it is not. Some of the material can be obtained from the Employment Security Commission which has lists of firms with four or more employees. When we consider agricultural and municipal workers, we find quite a problem.

Secondly, we must determine the occupations to be surveyed. Everything cannot be undertaken at one time; therefore a careful survey of the problem and possible boundaries must be made. Next, develop or adapt a survey instrument. There are instruments developed and available. Take a look at the instrument to see what your needs are and how it can be adapted to what you are seeking in the way of a goal. We propose to do this by means of a sample. For this, we need the support

of employers' associations and interested agencies in groups for a cooperative effort. We never have been able to do anything in a vacuum. We have tried, but we are going to have to work more diligently now than ever before and have cooperation among agencies. There must be coordination of contacts and followup with employers--meeting with those people who really know what the score is in their establishment. Next, the survey data is processed; and finally, the results are published and sent to area schools as well as local education agencies so that they in turn can plan at their level. This will involve local agencies in the overall statewide and hopefully regional and national planning.

There are several things that I would like to mention in reference to labor supply analysis. One source of information on labor supply is the data on available work seekers furnished by the Iowa Employment Security Commission. They have been very helpful in our efforts to develop state plans that we must develop to submit to the regional and the federal offices in conjunction with career education. Estimated and actual career education program enrollment data is extracted from scheduled reports. We are updating reports that we are going to be requesting and requiring as final reports and also as a report form--planning document. Next, we need information on the private schools' occupational training output. It is very interesting to know that even private schools and their agencies are not sure what their training output is. We've talked about this; we have made some progress, but there is a lot to be done. We are also concerned with enrollments in such things as MDTA, CEP, NAB jobs, and similar government training programs. Here again we've gone back to the Employment Security Commission for data to assist us in trying to present the

picture for ourselves and also for reports that we have to make. The next item is the indicators of private industry training from an appropriate section of the labor demand survey instrument. In other words, we hope that through the survey instrument we would develop and send out or use in interviewing, we would be able to get information about what is being done in training the labor force.

Student need survey is our third model component. Using high school juniors and seniors, we must determine what population we will try to reach. Next, a representative sample will be selected. Our assistant director continually asks the question, "What are you doing for these rural people, these little towns?" This is something with which we must be concerned. These are a great part of the State's potential so we must be concerned with the full gamut of students. We will develop or hopefully adapt a survey instrument. The instrument will be distributed to selected schools or used for interviewing, information will be collected, received and processed, data summaries prepared to indicate the range of student interest by occupational areas, and by again working with agencies, this information will be disseminated to local educational agencies, area schools, and others who have need of this in their planning process.

The fourth component of our model has to do with student followup. First of all, I'll discuss the arrangement of data relative to the groups involved; secondly, I'll give you the types of evaluation information or the information that we will generate through this followup. First of all, we must get the arrangement of data coordinated on a statewide basis for career education programs. The programs which we have in this state include the twenty-eight largest secondary schools

and over 3,015 area schools. Then we want to get statewide data by taxonomy. There is an Office of Education number which we use to coordinate with Dictionary of Occupational Titles to give a tie-in of the training program or the educational program we are offering with the DOT classification--your job description. We are doing this for secondary and post secondary programs which we are offering. Finally, we need data for each school district and each secondary district with career educational programs by taxonomy. We are proposing a taxonomy system from the point of view of an educational institution and a DOT title or number for industrial organizations so we have the ties. In regard to the types of information generated, we would have total completions and terminations within the framework of this arrangement of data. In other words, are these people unemployed, employed full time or in occupational training? Are they in an occupation which is related, or are they in something that is totally unrelated to the thing for which they have prepared? Are they going to continue their education? Are they going on to other programs in an extension of their original program--educational or career programs? Are they going into a technical occupation--in other words, further instruction or further activity? Or are they just disregarding everything they have done and striking out again on a new venture? Our final point is the weekly wage rates earned by students employed full time. Now I realize that this is a big picture.

In regard to labor supply, we talked with the Iowa Employment Security Commission some time ago in an effort to tap this information of supply. The problem was money. I think at that time we could have progressed if we had had money to go with it. Therefore, we come now

to looking for additional information. We have been in the money bind. We have worked with the Employment Security Commission. We have obtained information, but information in a form which is not usable. When you are talking about mechanics, you are talking about the educational programs of the development of auto mechanics and airplane mechanics not about mechanics generally. We need to do something to initiate and get under way another survey.

Secondly, demand/supply information is obtained from records that we get from our own local educational agencies. We have been working with the Employment Security Commission, and we feel that we can continue to work with them to get information relative to programs which concern them. We feel that if we do make a survey of industrial business firms and agricultural groups, we can get information from them regarding supply. Now we need to obtain this information for private schools.

Many schools throughout the state have done student interest surveys. Our guidance people in the state department have worked with these individuals trying to get information. The area schools have perhaps gone a little more extensively into student surveys; however, we still need a coordinated effort to get statewide, as well as local educational agency and area school coverage, so that we can provide that information for those people for use at that local level.

Finally, the material that I have presented is pretty much what we are doing right now in regard to a followup of students who have completed school in June or the first part of July. We will begin to get this information October 15. We are talking about an extended period--perhaps three years--so that we will have a greater period

of time in which to see what actually happens. A few months, we don't feel, is sufficient to obtain sound information.

In using manpower needs data and evaluating career education programs, there are several things we feel we can do. We have been talking about the mechanics of this--the basis for getting information or data that we can use in the final process. When we have this information, we want to develop an interface between labor demand, labor supply, and student needs to indicate then the potentially effective programs, whether we are looking at prospective programs or whether we are giving consideration to programs that have been in existence. We want to take a look at them and see just what they are accomplishing. Secondly, we would weigh program proposals against this interface. Next, we would have a review of followup data applicable to the program. We would determine outcomes of students from prior classes which again will help us to look at the interface and the followup data in an effort to see what tie-in that will have, how well our programs are progressing, and what they are doing. Finally, we would consider needs, data results and other pertinent information and then develop a recommendation for program action. Here, of course, we are considering the establishment of a new program. We would be considering continuing, modifying, or expanding existing programs, or we may be talking about eliminating current programs if such action is indicated through comprehensive study and analysis. We are actually doing these things, but it is not to the degree that we would like to be doing them.

As proposals come in for programs or we get ideas for programs from the local agencies, our consultants get together with these people and talk with them about their needs. If our consultants feel there is

a possibility, they will project further in terms of preparing a proposal, they continue to look at it, and finally, make a decision whether we can approve. Of course, the better information that we have, the better opportunity we have of deciding whether we should even begin to think in terms of progressing on a program proposal. In the state of Iowa we are planning on a statewide basis as well as an area basis--area represented by our area schools in the state of Iowa. Of course, the information which we have, as I have discussed it here, ties in with the CAMPS operation. There is greater need here to move forward in terms of coordination so that we can project a goal that is realistic.

IOWA MANPOWER NEEDS ASSESSMENT MODEL*

The identification and measurement of manpower needs must be accomplished before effective evaluation of career education programs can be implemented.

I. Components of Model

A. Statewide Labor Demand Survey. (Employers' needs.)

B. Statewide Labor Supply Analysis. (Public and private training output and available work-seekers.)

C. Student Needs. (Occupational preferences.)

D. Career Education Student Follow-up. (Outcomes of training programs.)

A. Statewide Labor Demand Survey

1. Develop employer inventory.

2. Determine occupations to be surveyed.

3. Develop (adapt) survey instrument.

4. Select survey sample.

5. Enlist support of employer associations and interested agencies and groups.

6. Coordinate contacts and follow-up with employers.

7. Process survey data.

8. Publish and disseminate results.

---

*A visual outline presented concurrently with Dr. Wold's discussion.

B. Statewide Labor Supply Analysis

1. Data on available workseekers furnished by Iowa Employment Security Commission.

2. Estimated and actual career education program enrollment data extracted from scheduled reports.

3. Information on private schools occupational training output.

4. Enrollments in MDTA, CEP, NAB-jobs, and similar government training programs.

5. Indicators of private industry training from appropriate section of labor demand survey instruments.

C. Student Needs Survey

1. Determine universe to be surveyed (high school seniors only, juniors and seniors, etc.).

2. Select representative sample, e.g., all schools with more than 1,000 students, urban schools, rural schools, various geographic locations, etc.

3. Develop or adapt survey instrument.

4. Distribute instrument to selected schools.

5. Receive and process resulting data.

6. Prepare data summaries indicating range of student interest by occupational areas.

D. Career Education Student Follow-up

1. Arrangement of data.

   a. Statewide-all career education programs.

   b. All programs -- twenty-eight largest secondary schools (over 3,000) and fifteen area schools.

   c. Statewide, by taxonomy for secondary and post-secondary programs

   d. Data for each area school and each secondary district with career education programs, by taxonomy.

2. Types of evaluation -- related data generated.

   a. Total completions and terminations.

   b. Employment status -- unemployment, employed full-time in occupation, trained, related occupation, or unrelated. In-state or out-of-state.

   c. Continuing education -- extension of original program, related vocational, related technical, not related.

   d. Weekly wage rates earned by students employed full-time.

II. Using Manpower Needs Data in Evaluating Career Education Programs

   A. Develop interface between labor demand, labor supply, and student needs to indicate potentially effective programs.

   B. Weigh program proposals against interface.

   C. Review follow-up data, if applicable to program, to determine outcomes of students from prior classes.

   D. Consider needs, data results, and other pertinent information and develop recommendation for program action, e.g., establish new program; continue, modify, or expand existing program or eliminate current program if such action is indicated through comprehensive study and analysis.

CHAPTER 6

ORGANIZING FOR PLANNING: CLARIFICATION OF FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT ROLES IN PLANNING

John K. Meskimen*

This morning we heard your distinguished Governor on "The Purpose and Need for Manpower Planning." My old friend, Dan Kruger, followed the Governor with a discussion of "Federal-State relations and Manpower Planning."

At lunch Neal Hadsell described for us "The Characteristics of a Good Manpower Plan." This afternoon Bob Krebill chaired a panel discussion on "Manpower Planning at the State Level." It now falls to me to try to "bring it all together" under the subject "Organizing for Planning-Clarification of Federal, State and Local Government Roles in Planning."

The way in which we organize ourselves to perform the planning function or segment of the management process including, in particular, the respective roles of the Federal, State and local authorities will reflect both our political philosophy and our notions as to what constitutes good public administration. By <u>good</u> we usually mean administration which (1) addresses the problems it is supposed to

---

*Chief, Division of Resource Programming & Review, Office of Policy Evaluation and Research, Manpower Administration, U.S. Dept. of Labor, Washington, D.C.

address; and (2) achieves a close approximation of the results predicted. Sorting all that out is a rather large order by any measure and it is enormously complicated by the uncertainty in the legislative field which prevails in Washington just now. However, I suppose one of the best tests of the skill of a planner is to see how he handles uncertainty. So--confidentially--I feel that I'm being put to the ultimate test this evening before this highly sophisticated and most pleasant company!

The uncertainty I have in mind, of course, relates to the probable course of action of the President with respect to the just passed Emergency Employment Act of 1971. He said some days ago that if Congress passed the bill, he would veto it. I also have in mind new welfare legislation. (The last time I looked--just before leaving D.C., the bill "most likely to succeed" was being referred to as OFF, Opportunities For Families.) The connotation is supposed to be--off the welfare rolls.

With those preliminaries out of the way, let me get to my assigned task by observing that the sentiment of this conference, as I interpret it, is overwhelmingly in favor of decentralization of all aspects of manpower program administration--including planning. There are some differences on certain substantive issues and there are undoubtedly some serious differences concerning the respective roles of the States and the cities within the States. But the sentiment favoring decentralization is overwhelming, nevertheless. Let me pause here to ask you to reflect on the proposition that the concepts of decentralized planning and comprehensive planning may not

be compatible, no matter how we may define them! I am concerned about this possibility.

My concern flows from the fact that comprehensive planning must, by definition, be centralized planning for the geographic area covered by the plan. The objection to centralized manpower planning as we now practice it is two-fold: First, that it tries to be comprehensive and second, that it is highly centralized in the Federal Government. My point is that even after planning is decentralized to the States and cities there will still remain the necessity for a high degree of centralized control in a central bureaucracy somewhere at the State and city levels--perhaps both--if planning is to be improved with respect to its comprehensiveness. Obviously, some trade-offs between the two concepts will be necessary. My purpose is merely to suggest that solutions to our deeper problems are not likely to be found through adjustments in what might be termed the bureaucratic balance.

I was prompted to raise this question because the considerable number of empirical studies of centralized planning which have been made over the past decade or so are almost unanimous in their findings that the avowed purpose of central planning--to shape developments to a pre-conceived design and on the basis of wholly rational criteria--was not being accomplished. Experience seems to show that it is possible for our perspectives to become so broad as to become unmanageable. One of the main reasons for this unmanageability is that our actions sometimes tend to generate results which were wholly unpredicted including confrontations between concerned local citizens' groups and the central bureaucrats at whatever level those bureaucrats are situated. (Examples: OEO and CAA's--

HUD and Model Cities--D/Labor (MA) and CEP's.) With that as my contribution to the "food for thought" department, I shall now adopt the behavior pattern of the typical expert consultant that we see so much of in Washington and move on--without bothering to supply an answer to the problem I have raised!

My assigned responsibility here this evening is to try to clarify the respective roles of Federal, State and local governments in the planning process. In preparing for this evening, it seemed to me that my basic options were: (1) to philosophize with you on what those roles should be or (2) to examine with you the current situation for indications of new trends which may be developing and, if we find any, to consider what they may portend. Fortunately for you, perhaps, I chose Option (2) and will leave the theorizing to Brother Kramish tomorrow afternoon who has for his subject the rather formidable title: Complex Variables Affecting the Planning Process and Available Tools for Developing and Implementing a Manpower Plan.

Let me try to summarize the legislative situation. For more than two years, this Administration has sought new manpower legislation. With the introduction of the President's major reform proposal in August 1969, we took the first step. Now, after twenty-two months, almost sixty days of Congressional hearings, thousands of pages recording testimony and floor debate, thirty days of committee mark-up sessions, a half dozen major Congressional confrontations, one Presidential veto and the prospect of yet another, some of us feel that we've journeyed that proverbial thousand miles and we are now looking for that last step!

This past Wednesday, as you know, the Administration's Manpower Revenue Sharing Act narrowly fell short of passage by the House of Representatives.

Even though the Administration's bill failed to pass, the debate on both sides of the aisle demonstrated strong, bi-partisan support for manpower reform legislation. Thus, we are convinced that there exists a broad, bi-partisan area of agreement on the fundamental directions of manpower reform along the following lines:

> First, it is agreed that our current, fragmented legislative authority for manpower programs must be rationalized and consolidated. Second, there is a consensus that greater planning and management responsibilities for manpower programs must be centered in State and local governments. These governments should be delegated sufficient authority, together with enough programming and funding flexibility, to shape Federally-funded programs into a better response to locally perceived needs than in the past. Third, appropriate types of public service employment have a useful role within the framework of a comprehensive manpower program.

The issue is not whether there should be a public service employment program, but what kind. Too often critics of public service employment look on the program as a disguised form of income maintenance. But as a manpower program, public service employment must serve as a stepping stone to permanent employment. For a program so prone to skull-duggery and abuse, legislative exhortation is no substitute for the sound legislative controls which the Congress so far has declined to enact.

Finally, there is bi-partisan agreement in Congress that the dramatic growth in Federal funds for manpower programs must continue. Nowhere is this commitment to the growth of manpower programs more striking than in the context of the welfare reform bill reported by the House Ways and Means Committee.

Welfare reform is focused on guaranteeing all families a basic Federal floor on family incomes. But, it also seeks to provide sufficient job training and employment opportunities to "pick family breadwinners up off that floor" and move them up the income ladder.

The Welfare Reform Bill would make the Secretary of Labor responsible for all aspects of programs for poor families whose adult members are employable. This would include income payments, job training and placement programs, and child care.

In the first year of the reform--fiscal year 1973--the Labor Department administered programs that would serve **over** 2.5 million adult recipients, which is approximately five times our present level of operations in the welfare area. About one and one-quarter million would be adults who are now welfare recipients. Another three-quarters of a million would be the working poor. Over one-quarter million would be women volunteering for the program even though they are not required to becuase they have working husbands, or small children in the home. Another one-quarter million would be out-of-school youth. Today, under the Social Security Act, the Labor Department receives less than $200 million for specially funded training programs for welfare recipients. Under welfare reform, that $200 million would increase seven or eightfold

in the first year. In other words, in one year, welfare funded training programs would reach a level which would have required eight years under regular manpower anti-poverty appropriations.

The headaches--and opportunities--of such dramatic growth are truly staggering. Such rapid expansion of Department of Labor responsibilities makes all the more imperative the need to reform our current manpower programs--in particular, the manner in which we presently plan and administer them. All of these prospects reinforce the logic of the decision to decentralize ever more responsibility to the State and local levels. There are two vital issues at stake. First, despite hundreds of millions of dollars in new manpower money under welfare reform, this new money will not be enough to train and employ every employable welfare recipient--as we are committed to as is. Thus, other manpower resources must be harnessed to the effort.

Almost three-quarters of those now served by manpower training and work programs would be eligible for welfare assistance. Program services and clientele are often indistinguishable between manpower programs and welfare programs.

Second, the welfare programs would need effective local institutions to train and employ welfare recipients.

The thrust of welfare reform is clear--Federal accountability must be maintained right down to the local level. However, this need not mean tens of thousands of new Federal civil servants delivering services to millions of clients. That would disregard the strengths of existing, community-based institutions.

We firmly believe that local officials can best identify and organize local manpower programs. The Congress and the Administration agree that State and local governments can best perform these local planning and management roles. Such a local approach to delivery of manpower services can then utilize the best community groups available--the employment service, community action agencies, the school systems, and welfare and human resources agencies. This should hold true for serving almost any client-welfare recipient or non-welfare recipient.

Let us now turn to some of the particulars. The classic issue of Federal/State relations was given masterful treatment this morning by our colleague, Dr. Kruger.

Even though the Congress saw fit to reject the Manpower Revenue Sharing Bill, the policy objectives reflected in it with respect to Federal/State relations remain the objectives of this Administration and will be actively pursued wherever and whenever it is possible to do so without benefit of specific enabling legislation. In other words, the Administration will undertake to achieve by administrative action those policy objectives which it sought through legislation. You will recall that the MRS Bill vested almost complete responsibility for planning and implementation of manpower programs in State and local authorities. The principal role of the Secretary of Labor was to obtain authority and funds from the Congress and to see that the funds were divided fairly among all contenders. For all practical purposes, the substantive role of the Secretary with respect to planning and operations was limited to reviewing and commenting on the State plans.

Concurrently with efforts of the Administration to obtain Manpower Revenue Sharing, the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System (CAMPS) had been subjected to a rather major overhaul. The objective, of course, is to keep our administrative mechanisms in harmony with our legislative requests on as current and complete a basis as possible. I'm pleased to be able to report to you that there is at the printers a new CAMPS document, identified as ICI No. 72-2, which contains all the detail on the changes which have been agreed upon at the Washington level by the nine agencies presently participating in CAMPS.

The basic objective of the changes is to hasten the process of developing manpower planning capability at the local and State levels. This process was begun, as you know, in truly practical and realistic terms a little more than a year ago with the initiation of grants to mayors and governors for the purpose of developing small staffs expert in all aspects of manpower but, in particular, in the planning aspect. We are presently funding about 600 of these staff positions and have high expectations for their success.

The CAMPS committees are to be strengthened by encouraging Governors and Mayors to reexamine membership on the committees to make certain that they are truly representative of interested groups within the community, have available to them an adequate level of planning expertise, and that their plans are responsive to State and local needs.

On the substantive side, the changes are built around the current network of CAMPS committees at the three levels, local, State and Federal. The most important change is in the character and role

of the committees. Heretofore, their principal functions were to exchange information and to effect as much informal coordination as possible. In their new role, the committees will have two major functions: First, they will provide advice to appropriate local and State government officials and Regional Manpower Coordinating Committees on local needs for manpower services and, second, they will assist Governors and Mayors to develop manpower plans including recommendations for funding for the geographic areas of their responsibility.

Although State and local committees share these two broad functions, there are specific functions which one or the other is generally better equipped to perform. The area committee and staff can more readily be representative of the community, and particularly of clientele groups. Consequently, it has a greater capacity to judge the mix of programs best suited to local needs and to be alert to the need for change when the situation requires this, or when performance falls short.

The State committee and staff, although it cannot be as representative or as close to the scene of action, has the responsibility for developing the plan for the balance of the State. With respect to plans developed by cities, it is in a strong position to assure that duplication of efforts and costs do not occur because services and facilities, which should be provided by existing programs, are in fact made available and are not ignored by local planners. Programs most directly relevant to manpower programs--Employment Service, Vocational Rehabilitation, Vocational Education and often welfare--are State administered.

Certainly, State committees and staff can be of great help to Regional Administrators and can expedite approval of plans. They are in position to offer technical assistance and advice to localities, and to catch failures of local plans to conform to Federal requirements.

As for the Federal role in decentralization, it should be clear that the Secretary of Labor and heads of other Federal Departments and agencies cannot abdicate responsibilities assigned to them under existing legislation. They must continue to define policies and objectives and to review and evaluate State and local performance to assure that the intent of the legislation is achieved.

We envision these changes--and other less important ones--as a revitalization of the committees to the end that they shall become the expert groups upon which Mayors and Governors will rely for assistance in planning manpower activities. Decentralization of manpower planning is going forward apace--and in spite of some disappointments on the legislative front--because this Administration is fully committed to the proposition that perceptions, interests and values are to a large extent formed by the location of the observer. Thus, local experts--those who are a part of the particular social environment being planned for--should be most able to define manpower targets and goals in terms of people needing services and employers needing employable workers and to submit a plan for their provision best calculated to get the job done in the shortest time and in the most efficient manner.

Plans developed at State and local levels must include all manpower and manpower related programs, regardless of the source of funding. The only significant distinction between programs controlled

by Department of Labor and those under the authority of other agencies is that plans proposed by Governors and Mayors, when approved by the RMA's, become the primary funding guide with respect to Department of Labor programs. It is our hope that we can persuade our sister agencies in CAMPS to adopt a similar posture.

I do not want to give anyone the impression that we in Washington believe this degree of decentralization--or any degree, for that matter--will solve all the problems connected with the design and delivery of manpower programs. We know that it won't. Technical problems such as insufficient data and inadequate coordination among agencies and programs will remain. So will vast, uncontrollable areas which are bound to create uncertainty and to severely test our flexibility and capability for making opportunistic adjustments in plans. One of the built-in limitations inherent in any reasonably comprehensive plan is its inability either to allow for uncertainty or to react quickly when significant unplanned events intervene. Those of us who have tried to make PPBS work have had a great deal of experience with this problem. Finally, there are the old bugaboos of the "balanced" plan and "political reality" testing. Both are likely to be around for some time.

In sum, it seems to this practitioner of the planning art that we can no longer pursue our trade secure in the knowledge that we have as starting points, validated and widely accepted or traditional standards such as the work ethic, respect for vested authority and leadership, however determined. Surely this is true today with respect to virtually the whole range of our societal relations. We have seen in the case of OEO with its CAA's, of HUD with Model Cities, and our own central city

CEP's that programs designed around traditional values have more often than not generated wholly unanticipated results in the form of confrontations between concerned groups of local citizens and the central bureaucrats.

In these days of vast uncertainty and social turmoil, the only logical and defensible position for an Administration that professes a deep belief in the ability of the individual citizen to make correct decisions in terms of his own well-being as well as that of his city, State and Nation, is to move the decision process as close to the individual citizen as possible. And that is what decentralization of manpower programs is all about.

Thank you.

CHAPTER 7

AN EMERGING MANPOWER NEED: INTER-AGENCY COORDINATION

Dr. George Beal*

I am not an expert in the field of manpower planning or manpower per se, but I have done quite a lot of research in the area of complex organizations and in organizational relationships. There are a number of problems today that are highly relevant to what I hope to communicate to you. They include the problems of complex bureaucracy and the problems of what I term categorical programs, meaning each agency or organization has a very specifically delineated task and in some way all of these little tasks are supposed to add up to the holistic approach. There are two problems here. Are the tasks really conceptualized, and are the goals of the agencies set so that they have a possibility of adding up? Even more important, however, is even if they were conceptualized properly, can the agencies get together? Can you get coordination? Can you add these into packages of services as needed? Bureaucratic red tape, forms, statistics, data, making data available, and all the papers that have to be filed are problems of a complex agency bureaucracy.

My paper is hopefully going to deal with a better conceptualization of the problem. However, I will move to some propositions about inter-organizational coordination, but I hope we will begin

---

*Chairman, Department of Sociology, Iowa State University

to offer, at least to the general level, some of the possible solutions for this. My major thrust will be an attempt to bring a more precise conceptualization to the environment in which we operate. Now a lot of the things that I will discuss will probably be redundant in one sense. You have seen these things, you have been involved in these things, you have heard about these things; but perhaps, as a sociologist, I can bring a little different conceptualization to the problem so that the pieces will fit together a little more meaningfully for you.

There are many ways to conceptualize what is happening to our society. The massive change in science and technology, our rapidly increasing population, and the pressure on our environment have produced major changes in the social organization of our society. This is sometimes what we overlook. Major changes in social organizations obviously create the need for new roles, new occupational categories, new needs for manpower, manpower development, and training. It is difficult to capture these social organizational changes in a tight conceptual summary. However, Roland L. Warren, in his book, Community in America,[1] does provide a framework within which a summary can be attempted. I will use this general heading and provide some elaborations which I hope are germane to this paper, and which will bring a little conceptual clarity to this enormous thing called social change in the environment in which we operate.

As seen by Warren, the following are some of the major social organizational changes in our society. I think it should be very

---

[1]Roland L. Warren, Community in America, Rand McNally, Chicago, 1963.

interesting and maybe a little bit rewarding and a little threatening that the first thing that Roland Warren mentioned in terms of changes in social organization is the increased specialization and division of labor with the job or occupational categories we have. That is the first thing he lists in terms of social change.

Secondly, he mentions the increased growth in number and kind of special interest groups and associations and agencies in our society. This is just another form of specialization at the social system or the group level. We have specialization at the individual level in terms of occupational categories, and we are also getting great specialization in our organizational structures. For example, in 1956, Gale Research Company in Detroit published the first edition of the Encyclopedia of Associations. They listed 8,500 nonprofit American organizations of the national scope. These are voluntary associations. In 1968 they listed almost 34,000 such organizations--voluntary associations. In the executive branch of the government there were approximately 2,000 agencies, bureaus, and departments in 1967. In that same year Paul Miller, then Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, said there were at least 200 federal agencies directly involved in what was called community development programs. The specialization organizations obviously created the demand for the problem solvers and the problem coordination.

A third major change is the increasing amount of vertical orientation and hierarchy from local to successful higher levels of organizations in both the public and the private sector. This will be one of the main themes of my presentation.

The fourth point is the continuation of the growth of large and complex organizations which will be associated in personalization and bureaucratic structuring of the relationships between men and among levels of bureaucracy. Complex organizations, public and private, profit and nonprofit orientated, demand the developing of specific guidelines, rules, and procedures for efficient programs. This is what we mean by bureaucratization. People within the organization, as well as their various clientele, are treated more impersonally. While there is an attempt to humanize the relationships in complex organizations, this has met only limited success. When we say complex organizations, we can also extend that to the relationship of the agency to the client system; the impersonalization is taking place there.

The fifth major change is the continued transfer of functions from the family or neighborhood group and community to private enterprise and public service agency. Note again, the large and increasing number of private and public organizations and the deliberations of the number of government agencies that we have in our society.

The continued rapid concentration and congestion of people, economic growth, industrial development in urban and suburban areas with the accompanying depopulation of rural areas is the sixth major change. Over seventy percent of the people live in these urban areas. Seventy percent of the people of the United States live on one percent of the land of the United States. A crucial issue is the role which the less populated areas will play in the distribution of people and economic and other institutions, as we look forward to an additional eighty million or 100 million Americans by the year 2000.

The last major change is the change in values and in increased challenge to existing values. Many of our traditional values are being challenged by today's youth, as well as people from many walks of life including the intellectual community and the left and the right.

A number of ideas from the above conceptualization are crucial to the discussion which follows. First is the transfer of functions and services from the family, the neighborhood, and the community to private enterprise and private and public agencies. Second is the overwhelming growth of these services--the services offered to and demanded by the people of our society--and the vast increase in type and scope of government agency programs. Third is the categorical specialization of these agencies and services which, in many cases, have very narrow and specific goals and tasks to perform. The fourth is the bureaucratization of the social system and the increasing amount of vertical orientation in these regions.

All phenomena exist in time and space--the planning is now, the projection is the future. I understand planning to be the projections to a future state of affairs. In our complex society we have developed a wide variety of social systems to attempt to facilitate the articulation of the individual needs and behaviors and to provide services through a wide variety of effective and efficient social interaction patterns usually formalized in some kind of an organization. We have developed a complex step of institutional structures--the family, government and related agencies, religion, economics, and recreation and cultural arts. We have organized formal voluntary associations. Despite the rapid and complex transportation and communication systems, the fact still remains that most of our interaction

patterns have some type of very limited space or territoriality basis. For many of the chief concerns of life, these primary interaction patterns are within this limited territoriality base. By territoriality we mean the geographic base or space dimensions of a social system that are formally, informally, or psychologically designated as the meaningful arena of identity, interaction, administration, planning, decisionmaking, action, and service delivery. For example, by territoriality we might mean such diverse spheres as neighborhood, community, multi-community, center city, suburb, county, multi-county, social economic area, state, region, or nation. These are territorialities. However, here the action really is within some kind of a community context as far as the behavior of most of the citizens are concerned. In addition, there are many other civil divisions--our suburbs, conservation districts, recreation districts, zoning districts, school districts, etc. People would drive in, live in, interact in, seek services in, and usually identify with and are legally responsible to and under the authority of the various territorialities in the social system. These territorialities are the arenas in which problems arise, decisions are made, planning hopefully occurs, and plans are carried out for what is assumed to be the common good of the members of these various systems.

Units of social organization exist in local territorialities; that is, communities or counties. These units are engaged in production and consumption of goods and services. In most cases these units are part of a vertical bureaucracy. They are part of some bureaucratic structure with various levels and headquarters outside of the local territoriality. However, these vertically oriented bureaucracies carry

out most of their activities at the local level. The local structure exists basically so something can happen at the community level. In theory that is the way it is supposed to work. These bureaucracies attempt to work with local individuals, institutions, agencies, formal and informal groups, and categories of people or client systems. They attempt to orient themselves horizontally to various client systems in the community. They are where the action is.

To add a little more clarity to this, the common assumption or myth that we seem to perpetrate and that national policies are formulated on is that a local territoriality is a unified and integral part of a larger society; that is, territorialities are often conceptualized as being unified social systems that are related to the larger society. In fact, some people would say that this is the way smaller territorialities actually relate to the larger society. The center circle is the community. A community as a totality relates itself to the suburbs. The county is the next unit, and it relates itself to a state. The state relates itself as a totality to some kind of a national social system. This is one way to conceptualize how we actually pile up our society from the smallest territoriality unit.

However, a more accurate conceptualization, as far as I am concerned, is something like this; namely, that we have a local territoriality which might be a community, a municipality, or a county in a generalized model, and really the way the territoriality is related to the rest of society is through a whole series of vertically, categorically identified units. This is what I mean by vertical orientation. For example, what we really find is that in many, many cases we have a vertical organization. A local unit is in the community but sixty

or seventy percent of its time is spent on meeting the demands, shuffling the papers and going to meetings. In other words, although they are supposed to be serving this community, most of their orientation is to the vertical system. Theoretically this system is supposed to work so that we would have minimum use of time and resources on the vertical system, and would be establishing horizontal relationships and serving the client system out here in this territory.

Now we can come back to the general conceptual model of how I think local units are related to the higher level units. Within this local territoriality there are many diverse local subsystems--retail outlets, manufacturing plants, banks, churches, public and private agencies, local units of government, schools, and formal voluntary associations. Each of these differentiated local social systems is linked in some fashion with the outside world through a vertical linkage--local chain stores to district, state, and national headquarters; branch plants to national offices; local schools to state and national departments of education; local governments to state and national governments; local churches to district, national, and denominational headquarters; local agencies to district, county, state, and national headquarters; and local formal voluntary associations to state, region, national, and international headquarters (by voluntary association I mean Rotary clubs, Federation of Women clubs, League of Women Voters, Chamber of Commerce, American Legion, etc.). These local subsystems usually have, when compared to each other, diverse goals, diverse policies and programs, different beliefs, different views of the world, different attitude structures, different norms--what is acceptable behavior, and provide different services. Very often they

have different geographic headquarters, different though sometimes overlapping membership, different reference groups (by different reference groups I mean they get their reward, prestige, or status from different people), and they attempt to serve different client systems. We might elaborate a little bit on client systems. In many cases we find that two agencies, theoretically working in the same ballpark as far as goals and objectives, are actually competing for clientele. In the meantime, in many cases we have all kinds of clients that never get served at all. Some agencies try to work through other organizations. The summary of all of this is that basically these local subsystems are usually vertically oriented; that is, they are oriented to systems which they are a part of vertically outside of the community. They have trouble orienting themselves horizontally to other agencies or organizations or to client systems or categories of people in the community. Why are they vertically oriented? Well, they feel somewhat comfortable within these nice, neat, confined rules, regulations, structure, etc. In many cases, people at the local level get many more rewards from the vertical system than they do from serving the client system out here. Your promotion depends pretty much on what your boss up above you says, so you perform in terms of getting those kinds of rewards. Those behavior patterns may or may not be consistent with serving the client system out here, depending upon the person above you in the bureaucracy. The person above you may be fighting the same battle at the state level that you are fighting at the lower level; namely, he is playing the numbers game, too; and therefore, he is paying more attention to making his system work internally so he looks good rather than trying to establish systematic linkage or coordination with another agency so both

of you could really meet the needs of this client system out here. I hope these words are not too harsh, but this is the way we see the real world.

Vertical patterns are usually highly structured by clearly defined contracts, charters, legislative, or administrative policies, and administrative procedures. The vertical patterns are usually bureaucratically oriented, characterized by relatively rational planning, relatively specific goals, prescribed means to reach those goals, prescribed authority patterns, norms (what is accepted as good performance), rewards and punishments to go along with meeting those norms, and a set of beliefs and sentiments. Vertical patterns are usually serviced by professional workers, program aides, materials, training programs, and money resources; but they are serviced from a vertical bureaucracy. On the other hand, horizontal orientation of local units may be characterized as lacking structure. Local units may have diverse or specialized goals, a lack of rational planning, and diffuse and informal roles. Basically the role within the vertical structure--job, job description, accomplishments--is pretty well defined. When one starts moving between agencies, it is much harder to define clearly what a person's role is. In horizontal orientation there are different norms and sanctions, reward and punishment structures, and sentiment from those in vertical orientation. There is basically a lack of authority in horizontal orientation. It is a matter of good will--getting along with people. Therefore, it is kind of a loose, diffuse, symbiotic relationship based on interaction and goal accomplishment.

Packages of services needed to solve individual or social problems are difficult to mobilize. Since each of these organizations is basically categorical, each has one little element to deliver. Attempts to this end are usually based on some type of exchange or coordination premise. Results are often ineffective. In many local territories, for example communities, there is no decision making unit or arena for many kinds of decisions. Decisions are made on a specific problem by a coalition of individuals or groups. Major decisions are often made by the general or issue area power structure--the informal power structure in these communities.

All local systems are not vertically oriented. However, our research shows that those that tend to be most effective and have the most prestige and resources are the ones that are vertically linked.

My opinion is that one of the most significant social organization issues involves three main tasks: 1) the increasing role of a formal organization, private organization, and private and public agencies set up to meet the needs of people; 2) the high degree of bureaucratization and the categorical specialization of functions and services to be delivered--the vertical bureaucracy orientation of these social systems; and 3) the fact that individual and social system problems do not define themselves in nice, neat, categorical, specialized needs nor are there packaged resources available for problem solutions.

We have all the categorical organizations set up. However, the individual or the social system problems do not define themselves in nice, neat, categorical, specialized needs. The agencies and the problems are two different "balls of wax." This doesn't mean that the

resources aren't available to solve the problems, but they are categorically organized. These services, represented by the categorical agencies, are not prepackaged resources that are available directly for problem solution.

An example to illustrate the point I am trying to make considers an individual problem--specifically the alcoholic. In the goal of rehabilitation, different alcoholics will probably need a wide range of services for rehabilitation. For example, a juvenile alcoholic may need the following services: probation supervision, counseling or psychiatric treatment, Alcoholics Anonymous, family counseling, health and medical care, welfare services, vocational testing, vocational retraining, credit counseling, employment, and employment supervision. In the real world we find most of these services available. Yet, they are segmented into specialized, individual agencies. In most cases the alcoholic has the responsibility of trying to find these services, many of which he doesn't know exist. Then he has to determine the packages of services which meet his needs, and attempt to secure the proper mix of the services to meet his needs. After one or two abortive attempts to secure individual services, usually resulting in referrals to another agency, the individual alcoholic refers himself to the local tavern or bar. In many cases the agency professionals are aware of only the services of their agency; they are not aware of other services. If they know of other services, they have not established the relationship of systemic linkage with other agencies and their personnel so that the total needs of the individual can be assessed and the total package of services needed to meet with the individual can be delivered. Though alcoholics have been used as an example, similar examples can be made

of a wider range of individual problems, including employment. Interestingly enough, there have been a number of experimental programs with community coordinators whose role is to bring these categorical services to bear on specific needs of the alcoholic. These programs have been relatively successful. Senator Hughes' program on comprehensive alcoholic care upon which the federal legislation is now based was tried out in this state; and from our evaluation of it and research on it, it was relatively successful. Again the point is that there are many services available, but they don't get delivered.

I think much greater human and financial resources should be allocated to the development and the testing of institutional innovation or other ways of delivering services. However, I will try to stay with existing systems. What are the new role requirements to make this system work that we now have? I will accept, as the initial premise, that personnel performing the various roles in these agencies need specialized training. The knowledge and technology you need for an agency whether it be health, welfare, urban planning, mental health, employment, retardation, education, etc., and the rapid expansion and the scope of the number of these agencies indicate that there is much to be desired in the background and training of the professionals and subprofessionals in these agencies. There needs to be specialized training; but with the fast growth of these agencies, I would doubt (and many of you as administrators would doubt) that in many cases we have these agencies staffed with people who have competent training in this area. However, there is much more crucial occupational role definition and training needed for a new role or an additional component of existing roles for many people in existing agencies.

Let's take a look at coordination. On a very general level, coordination can be defined with respect to the decisionmaking activities of interdependent organizations. Coordination as a process occurs when each organization is adapted to the others. We don't like to admit that we have to have some adaptation to get coordination, but coordination occurs pretty much on an exchange theory basis. As a process, coordination involves a set of organizations or units within an organization that are aware of, or are interdependent with one another, or have the same goals. Interdependence among organizations or units may be viewed as one of two types. Organizations or units may have facilitative interdependence which permits two or more organizations or units to simultaneously maximize their goals. Facilitative interdependence basically says that if they cooperate, then both will be better off. On the other hand, organizations or units may have competitive interdependence--one organization or unit attempts to maximize its goals only at the expense of another. Sometimes that is the only way a job can get done.

Historically, much has been written about coordination as one important element of management. However, it should be noted that almost all of this discussion has dealt with internal bureaucratic coordination. It is not this concept of coordination that is most relevant however.

The ideal type of vertical coordination is called coordination by standardization or by authority. In this case, there are direct lines of authority to various levels of the bureaucracy; and in a sense, the head person can call the shots. He has the authority to make the decisions. If the program is not implemented or if the behavior is not

consistent with the statement, he has the power to reward or punish, to hire or fire. This is what happens ideally; however, an example of what can and does happen is found in some communities where there is a mayor or a city manager, after a period of time, governmental units that are theoretically under the authority of the mayor or city manager tend to become self-directive. The local fire department chief or the public welfare director goes his own way because he has more client systems to defend his position than does the mayor. However, when speaking of linking different agencies, one person doesn't have the authority for this type of coordination.

A second type of coordination is one which is called coordination by plan. Basically, this says that there is no authority pattern but agencies that have a common set of goals or complementary goals can get together and through written agreement, coordinate the delivery of certain kinds of services and agree to perform certain kinds of functions. This may or may not be a binding contract. In this case there would be one key agency. This key agency would set up plans, written agreements for delivery of services, and certain functions to be performed by various agencies. For example, the civil defense director makes an agreement with the fire department. The fire department says they are willing to do item A, but the civil defense director must do item B. This is one form of coordination by plan--an agency to agency relationship.

Probably a more effective plan would be a system arrangement. In this plan, not only do written agreements or relationships exist between the core agency and the peripheral agency but each of these agencies is related to all others by agreement. Everyone (theoretically)

knows what everyone else is supposed to do. Where there is no authority structure, agency to agency and system arrangement are two types of coordination by plan. As I see it, these basically cover the kinds of organizational coordinations that exist.

The third type, and the most common type, I think, is the type of coordination labeled mutual adjustment. Basically this means that there is no higher authority or formal sanction structure. There seem to be two main types that exist. One is predicated on an informal basis where agencies agree verbally that one will do this and the other will do that. The functions are divided, the complementary of the functions is found, and the agreement is conducted on a basis which is not formalized in writing and not formalized in function specification. Another possibility in a mutual adjustment model is one key organization that relates itself to many other organizations; or lastly, system of mutual adjustment where there are relationships that also exist among other agencies. This is as far as a lot of coordination goes. One agency sets up informal relationships with a whole host of other agencies, and has no knowledge of how it ties in to all these other functions being performed to add up to a holistic package. This bureaucratic status role of authority, norms, and sanctions is not present in either of these types of coordination by mutual adjustment. One must modify and look beyond the usual internal bureaucratic coordination theory for explanatory concepts to describe an account for mutual adjustment coordination.

Using the work of Homans and Blau as a basis, Levin and White have adapted an exchange theory for use in examining interorganizational

behavior coordination. In their book, Levin and White define organizational exchange as any voluntary activity between two organizations which has consequences--actual or anticipated--for the realization of their respective goals or objectives. Organizations are conceptualized as dependent for their goal attainment on the operation of certain input-output processes. They have certain kinds of resources; they are trying to get a job done. In order to function in the pursuit of their goals, all organizations are assumed to need inputs or resources which they turn or convert into outputs. It is assumed that the resources not under the control of a particular organization are in scarce supply so they cannot be obtained as a free commodity. One source of resources for an organization is another organization in its environment. Therefore, it may be assumed that the norms of reciprocity govern the securing of the resources for these environmental organizations. Usually the exact value cannot be attached to a particular exchange relation of this type by either the giver or the receiver. It is this lack of specificity that differentiates more thoroughly social exchanges between organizations from strict economic exchanges. The incurring of reciprocal obligation implies the assignment of cost to participate in a relationship between organizations. Over time it is assumed that if relationships continue, the actors in organizations attempt to achieve a satisfactory balance of exchange with other organizations in their environment. However, costs are difficult to specify; in many cases it is a matter of individual or organizational perception of the situation. The giver and the receiver put very

different values on what they exchange. An additional complicating factor is that one organization's involvement may be governed to a degree by expectations of what can be obtained in return from a third party--a generalized "other" in the environment. For example, several agencies may be highly motivated to coordinate activities because they think the higher vertical authority in their respective bureaucracies will reward them or that all agencies will be rewarded for successful planned service by increased funds from the legislature.

Here are some very general level propositions, and I'll move to some on a lower level. Coordination will have a higher probability of occurrence if the following occur: 1) a more precise definition of client problems and the resources needed for problem solutions, 2) a recognition of the holistic rather than the categorical approach to problem solution, 3) a strong orientation towards problem solutions rather than specific service delivery, 4) organizations with a systemic linkage rather than a boundary maintenance orientation (i.e., not establishing relationships with any other agency), and 5) staff understanding and skill levels which will facilitate coordinated action and behavior. One point I want to make in relation to (5) is the question raised about the amount of specialized training the people at the lower end of the bureaucracy have to perform their jobs satisfactorily. Other questions would be raised about people at the lower level really understanding how a bureaucracy functions and how to function in a bureaucracy. Studies we have done of in-service training show that there is almost no training at lower levels in interagency coordination. I might add that a lot of people at the state level don't have this training either.

Now let me go to a series of six propositions--some specific and some more general propositions--that we have found in our research that say, "This is the environment or these are the conditions under which we tend to find effective interorganizational coordination--effective in that they are linked, they do know what each other is doing, and in their minds or by some other criteria they are getting the job done." We are talking about the local level here.

1. When there has been systemic linkage or coordination established at a higher vertical level between authority positions, individuals or groups in the bureaucracy, coordination at a local level is more easily gained. In fact, whether you like it or not, we tend to find more coordination at the local level than we do at the district, the state, or the regional level. However, we do find in those situations we have studied in areas of alcoholism, mental health, and in the whole health field where we have done quite a lot of research that if there is strong coordination at the state level, coordination becomes a norm in the system.

Even though there is a high degree of coordination, for instance at the state level, the people at the state level have to be relevant to the people at the local level or it doesn't make a bit of difference. You know that if you have a bureaucracy in which there is no respect, there is no internal coordination. It doesn't make any difference how much coordination there is agreed upon the state level, the people at the local level can always find ways to get around it if they wish to do so.

2. There is more coordination when it can be shown that there is a convergence or complementary goal from the local social syste[illegible].

Basically all I am saying here is that in many cases when you go to another agency to try to get coordination, you start specifically with the service or the resource you want him to give you. You don't start at the level of saying, "Look, this is a goal for your agency, this is a goal for this agency, and it looks like they are the same goal." Instead you say, "It looks like our goals are highly complementary. What resources do we have that we can coordinate and meet these goals?" They may be completely congruent, or two different facets, or highly complementary. We find that when coordination is started with a goal orientation, we get a higher degree of coordination. We also find a higher degree of coordination when the social system involved in coordination believes it has a specific or unique resource to contribute to a program and that the program is valued. However, remember that before the agency head can believe in your program he has got to understand it. Sometimes all we do is go after the service not showing where the service or resource fits into the program.

3. Coordination is also gained when there is a need to establish, maintain, or enhance a social system image. This occurs when in reality a given social system thinks that this type of coordination will give him status, will give him prestige, and assumes that there are relevant reference groups, and there is somebody out there who cares about what he is doing. Sometimes agencies will coordinate because they think they are attached to or are a part of the program.

4. Another interesting thing we have found in our studies is that a high degree of coordination is achieved when a given agency has the fear of not being involved in a successful program. This is reverse status. It is not so much that he believes in your program, but he

figures this thing is going to be successful; and if he is not identified with it, he will lose out on some of the goodies, such as status and prestige. A corollary of that is that given agencies will tend to coordinate with other agencies when there is an opportunity to become identified with a higher status group.

5. Another incentive for coordination is a program which offers an opportunity to establish the social system in a new area of activity that is status giving or needs fulfilling. This could be called Parkinson's Law, kingdom building, or anything you want; but in many cases if it is nobody's job, some agency or organization is willing to take it on because they see this as a new activity.

6. Finally, the obvious proposition is that cooperation is gained when there are reciprocal obligations to the sponsoring group.

CHAPTER 8

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES IN THE PLANNING PROCESS

Dr. Leonard Lecht*

The National Planning Association is a private, non-profit policy research organization. Of course, being a private, non-profit organization means that we are largely, but not entirely, supported by the federal government. Basically our business is looking at the future using numbers and economic projections, such as what will the gross national product be ten years from now, how rapidly can productivity be expected to grow, and what will the labor force be like at some future time.

In the course of making projections, our business involves a number of studies of the manpower implications of national programs and of things that are often called national goals, such as pollution control. However, right now I think that it might make more sense to talk about planning, goals, manpower programs, and policy. The word planning is used in two different contexts. We often think of planning in terms of how efficiently we use the resources that are given to us, in terms of a budget, and when considering problems such as the ones of interagency coordination and cost effectiveness.

---

*Director, Center for Priority Analysis, National Planning Association, Washington, D.C.

I'm not going to discuss that type of planning. I'm mainly concerned with another kind of planning, the planning of "Where do we go from here? What are our goals? What will they be next year, three years from now, five years from now?" and the budget, rather than being the constraint, becomes a kind of variable--"What would it cost, for example, to have the kind of manpower program we think the economy should have five years from now?" As we look at the goals of manpower policy, there are many goals; and they are not always consistent with one another. It seems to me they can be broken down into three safe groups. Much has been said, for example, about the role of manpower programs as an instrument of fiscal policy--of helping to avert the manpower bottleneck which contributes to inflation. Another goal of manpower policy is to train the skilled and semi-skilled workers we need for other national goals in other national programs. Right now our concern is in finding the manpower we need for environmental protection of many types. Five years from now we may be wondering where we will get the manpower we need to rebuild a decaying central city, which by that time, I'm sure, will require massive injections of money and manpower even exceeding the large sums allocated now. The third goal of manpower programs has been to upgrade the economic status of what we call the poor--or what the Department of Labor has chosen to call the disadvantaged--by increasing their earning capacity and employability.

All of these goals have some operational context. If manpower programs in the late 1960's had been on a larger scale, they would probably have contributed more to averting inflation by easing

manpower bottlenecks in many areas. This is less important now. Manpower considerations are very important in achieving goals to which we are giving a high priority right now--health is one example. One of the big reasons why costs are increasing in health and why our delivery systems are ineffective is manpower bottlenecks. The most operational goal of the manpower program has been the third of these goals. What do we do to upgrade the economic status of low income people, particularly low income people who are unemployed or who are in the "fringe area" of the labor market and whom we think should be in it. Now these are not the only goals that exist. Do we notice the fringes of the goals of manpower programs? Right now, to cite one instance, the Department of Labor--along with other governmental agencies--is very much concerned with unemployed scientists and engineers, particularly aerospace and electronic engineers. While these people have many problems of employment, I don't think they would be numbered (as yet) among the poor or the disadvantaged. It may be in a few years from now the Department of Labor or other governmental agencies will be concerned with the large numbers of young people coming out of colleges seeking jobs in teaching for whom there are not many jobs. If you look at the manpower programs, about four-fifths of the MDTA Institutional trainees and a few less of the regular on-the-job training people are unemployed or they list being unemployed as their status prior to entering training. Well over half of this group are people who come from poor families, according to the Social Security Administration's definition of poverty. So manpower programs in the United States have developed as a kind of social program--really a

social welfare program in many aspects--based on the premise that we can join the disadvantaged person's needs for income with the economy's need for more and better trained manpower. It isn't always evident that this is necessarily the most effective or the only kind of manpower program. In terms of expense and placement of program completion, these would probably be greater if we trained fewer disadvantaged and if we concentrated on training more people who have completed high school or who had successful work experience; but we've slowed down that goal because of emphasizing the social policy aspects of manpower programs. Some programs, as you know, have tended to take the more skilled and better educated among the disadvantaged. I think it is also significant to note that manpower programs are only one of a large number of programs which intend to aid the poor. Manpower programs in many ways compete with these other programs or are complementary to them.

We have obtained some figures for the fiscal year 1968. In 1968, the federal government supporting through its own programs or agencies was said to have spent some $22 or $23 billion on programs to aid persons who were poor or who would have been poor in the absence of this federal support. About three-fifths of this sum, over $12 billion, represented cash benefits, mainly cash benefit payments to beneficiaries of OASDA social security, most of whom are not candidates for manpower programs. The second biggest item in this total, I believe about one-fourth out of $4 billion, was made up of different kinds of health benefits--Medicaid and Medicare benefits--to people who were poor. This kind of benefit becomes considerably larger for people, many

of whom are candidates for manpower programs, if they are recipients of the programs. In 1968 the regular manpower skill training programs and the work experience programs run by the Department of Labor and those originally run by OEO accounted for a little more than $1 billion ($1.12 billion) out of this $22 billion. This was a little more than five percent of all the federal government expenditures in aid of the poor. These programs may be defined in different ways. Vocational rehabilitation can be included, as can part of the employment service. This might well run the total of federal spending for manpower training in aid of the poor to something like $2 billion or seven or eight percent of what the federal government spends to aid the poor. These programs appeal to different groups of different sizes and with different problems. Yet I do think that it is fair to say that providing income--that is, either income in money to cash benefits or income in time to remedy destitution--rather than training or improving skills has been the primary interest in the national program when dealing with poverty. Manpower programs, I think, in the next ten years are likely to witness much of their growth as a corollary of these income maintenance programs. In 1968 the federal government support for public welfare assistance was about $3.5 billion or several times that amount spent for manpower training of different types, but this omits what has been the nation's most effective anti-poverty program and the nation's most far-reaching manpower program--simply economic growth.

Economic growth of course, doesn't have the goal of reducing the number of the poor people by increasing the skills of people. This is one of its side effects, but the effect has far exceeded that of any

other program specifically aimed at reducing the number of poor people. Again all these comparisons must be limited and qualified. If we look at the series of economic expansions since World War II--a period of fairly rapid growth--the number of poor people, according to the Social Security Administration's definition, has declined by an average of 2 million poor people a year. This led the Council of Economic Advisors to get so enthusiastic about economic growth in 1969 that they estimated in ten more years poverty would be eliminated. This is a statistical manipulation; however, it is interesting to note that in 1970 when the economy did not grow, the number of poor persons increased for the first time in, I believe, about ten years. Economic growth, as I am sure you know, reduces the number of poor people because it increases the demand for labor. Basically, it makes for a tight labor market.

Economic growth also bypasses many people, particularly those people who don't have a strong relationship with the labor market--the aged who are too old to work or welfare mothers receiving public welfare assistance. This raises the question: What about the role of the manpower program in a period when the economy isn't growing very rapidly, such as last year? The rapid expansion of the manpower programs in the second half of the 1960's was largely possible because the economy was growing rapidly. Unemployment rates of four percent or below characterized almost all of that period so the reasonable prospect of employment on which the manpower program was based was there. But what happens in the situation when unemployment rates for, say, the nonwhite teenagers in many of the central cities are running something between

twenty-five and forty percent, or what will happen in a situation in which the economy is growing very slowly but many thousands of veterans who have been in Viet Nam and elsewhere are being released from the armed forces? What is the role of manpower programs in planning? What are the goals in this kind of environment? There are still some areas of the economy in which job opportunities are growing, probably the biggest single area being health occupations at all kinds of levels and skills--from hospital attendant to physician. We know the other areas--environmental pollution control, honest and competent automobile mechanics, and several others.

Many people in this situation have discussed the role of shifts in national priorities in generating employment for people in a period of recession. We estimated in the study of Manpower Needs for National Goals in the 1970's that a concentrated effort to rebuild American cities could directly or indirectly generate jobs for as many as 10 million people, mainly blue-collar workers of various types. These things could happen, and we see some evidences that they are happening. Federal budgets, say, for pollution control, are increasing fairly rapidly. I believe President Nixon is asking for an increase in budgetary authorization from $1.4 billion in 1970 to $3.1 billion in 1972 which is more than 100 percent increase. There has been a shift in national priorities away from defense in spite of the size of the defense budget. It's big, but as a share of the GNP the pot claimed by National Defense is smaller than it was in the first half of the 1960's. However, these shifts in national priorities in terms of how we actually use our resources have still been on a modest scale,

so the problem of relating manpower programs to jobs is twofold. The economy is growing very slowly and the changes in national priorities which could open up many more jobs have only occurred in a few areas (such as pollution control) and on a limited basis.

In this kind of a situation many people point to public service employment as a source of jobs for graduates of the training programs and for the unemployed. As you know, legislation has just been passed--somewhat different legislation--by each house of Congress that would substantially increase public service employment. This kind of public service employment has a heavy work experience and income maintenance component in it. The idea is that most of these people would otherwise be unemployed; and, therefore, if they contribute in keeping streets clean, or manning hospitals, or helping to build roads, or keeping parks and public recreation areas in good order, or more efficiently disposing of our solid waste, they represent a thrust to the economy because the output of these people would otherwise be zero. Personally I believe this makes a great deal of sense as an emergency measure in a period of recession. However, this kind of temporary measure need not involve and probably would not involve much in the way of job training, particularly skilled training. The idea here is to get people on a payroll, to get them doing something which contributes to society, which can be implemented fairly quickly and for which funds are available.

Then there are longer term prospects for training disadvantaged people in public service careers. The federal government does have a public service career training program which, I believe, last year had about 25 thousand people enrolled in it. We hear a great deal

about shortages of people in public service occupations and many of these shortages exist. The Upjohn Institute estimated several years ago that there were some 130 or 140 thousand nonprofessional, unfilled jobs in the cities of over 100 thousand population at the time. Interest in public service employment a few years ago went hand in hand in many cases with what was called new careers. The idea was that people who were rich in the experience of life, but didn't have much money or few credentials, could serve in a variety of capacities in human service occupations where their experience might be a valuable substitute for more formal training. These people could use their experience plus on-the-job training in place of more readily acknowledged credentials. Most of these new career jobs were in health, education, and social welfare. Most of the public service jobs which the Upjohn Institute study reports are in these three areas. There were also jobs in areas such as recreation, keeping streets clean, and environmental areas. Now I think the experience of the new careers did demonstrate that in many cases people who had this background of experience with some training could do a very good job. They could serve as interpreters between community programs in the community. Numbers of people who started out as hospital aids ended up, with more training, as licensed practical nurses.

There were also some cautions to be observed from this new careers experience. In many cases this meant training people for jobs in which there were very poor earnings, in which upgrading opportunities were slight, and in which there was very limited job security. In effect, in many areas, the new careers programs were

training people for occupations which were poverty prone in the first place, such as many types of hospital aids' occupations. There is no law which says this must continue, and I'm sure many of you could point to examples that show that there can be progress. The experiences of the future need not repeat the experience of the past, but this is one of the cautions in a rapid expansion of public service employment.

We are allowing for a considerable growth of public service employment as a temporary measure or in terms of small long-term skilled training. The big problem for the manpower programs is still that of the dynamic economy. For example, in a period of economic stagnation, manpower programs can provide a small minority of people with skills in selected growth occupations; but otherwise the skilled training programs may run into the danger of giving people a lot of new and nonusable skills. So the fundamental problem isn't so much one that can be solved by manpower policy as it is one which involves fiscal and monetary policy; that is, how to get the economy moving again. This, of course, gets into a different series of questions. One of the ways in which the economy might get moving again is perhaps larger public expenditures on behalf of the shift in priorities that many of us have been hearing and reading about. The big problem for manpower programs is the problem of respective demand, something the programs are not well equipped to handle.

On a more optimistic note, the present recession will end. I don't know if it will end in 1971 or 1972, but history shows that recessions seldom last too long. What about the long term goals of the manpower programs once we are out of this recession? What will

happen to the objectives of the manpower programs in this kind of environment? Some clues are given by the legislation now before Congress. Either the administration's family assistance plan will be passed or one of the various alternatives which have looked more likely, particularly those which Congressman Mills and the Ways and Means Committee have been considering, will get the nod. All of these plans point to an expanded role of manpower training or new goals for manpower training in two areas. One is for the people who are now receiving public welfare assistance. A second is a considerably greater role for manpower training for the working poor, for people who have regular full-time jobs which yield them low incomes.

There has been discussion as long as there has been a manpower program about the large numbers of people receiving relief. Relief roles have grown, particularly in large cities such as New York, where expenditures for public welfare assistance are now greater than the city's expenditures for elementary and secondary education. There has been a great deal of thinking in many programs about what do you do for the people on relief. To quote the slogan: How do you get them off welfare and onto workfare? I think the considerations here are, in part, economic and, in part, political and ideological. We've seen, through experience with programs such as WIN and its predecessors, that there is some evidence many people heading AFDC families are very largely waiting. There are some of these people who would prefer to work if there were jobs available or if they had marketable skills. There was a survey of the heads of families receiving AFDC support in 1967 with, I believe, 1.3 million female heads of families being

surveyed. Of that total, about one-eighth, or 150 thousand, would have preferred to work but they believed they lacked marketable skills. There were others who had some record of experience of work. Just as a rough bench mark we might double the number who said they were on relief because of a lack of marketable skills to estimate that, at that time, about 300 thousand female heads of poor families, or one-fourth of the total, might have figured as candidates for employment or training. This implies that there is another large number of heads of families receiving AFDC--perhaps as many as three-fourths--who are not reasonable candidates for training or employment. Other people would probably arrive at other estimates.

It may be that we should leave the questions Should the women be at home? or Should they be working? or, What is their role in caring for young children? to the psychiatrist, the psychologist, the women's liberationist, or perhaps to the mothers themselves. However, there is an economic consideration involved in attempting to look at the role of the training for welfare mothers as part of manpower programs. One of these considerations is that without elaborate skills, without much more training, most of these mothers would probably be earning less from work than they would receive from public assistance. There was one study done, I think about 1966, which did survey on a large number of mothers who were receiving public welfare assistance. According to this study, most of these mothers received more from public welfare assistance than they would have received had they been at work with the skills that were available to them.

A second consideration is that the training program involved also involves child care and particularly child care for mothers with preschool children. Less than half of the women who head families receiving AFDC support had preschool children. An estimate of what it costs to provide adequate child care for a child under 6 ranged from about $2,000 to $2,300 per child according to the government's own estimate. I believe there is a bill before Congress now to extend child care training to mothers of low income families generally which is based on a cost of about $2,000 per child. Besides these training costs, the cost of providing adequate child care to a mother who has one child of 4 or 5 would be $2,000; if she has two, it would be $4,000. If the mother has one preschool child and two school aged children, the probable cost would be about $3,000 or $3,500. If we look at the costs involved in terms of child care facilities, a great many of these mothers seem a far more likely prospect for AFDC than for a very elaborate skill training program. Of course, there are others for whom this is not the case.

There is another group for whom the goals of manpower programs are likely to include a considerably greater role for training; and these are the working poor. In a period of recession like 1971 when there are more than 5 million people unemployed, the working poor don't get very much attention; but let the unemployment rate fall to about 4 percent and the problems of the working poor will again come into public consideration. We have completed a study for the Manpower Administration which deals with the characteristics of poor persons in the labor force. The year 1966 (a period of high prosperity

with an unemployment rate of 3.8 percent of the labor force) was the base year for this study; in that year we estimate there were almost 8 million people with work experience or who were looking for work who were also poor. Over half of that 8 million group--more than 4 million of those people--worked throughout the year; that is, they worked for at least fifty weeks during the year. A large majority of that group held full-time jobs when they did work. We attempted to estimate the size of the working poor population in the mid-1970's, assuming that there was no serious recession that lasted long and the economy kept growing somewhere between 4 and 4.5 percent a year after price increases. We estimated that by 1975 there would still be over 5 million poor persons in the labor force. These are people who are poor according to the Social Security Administration's definition of poverty which, for a poor person's family in 1970, was about $3,900 a year or less income.

According to the President's Income Maintenance Commission's report in 1969, there were 10 million jobs in this country which paid less than $1.60 an hour; these included a number of jobs in state and local government. If a person who receives $1.60 an hour--the federal minimum wage--worked throughout the year, he worked for 2,000 hours a year and would have received an income from work of $3,200. This was about $700 less than what the Social Security Administration regarded as a poverty income for a poor person's family.

What do these working poor persons do? I was surprised to see in the 1966 statistics that there were over 100 thousand poor school teachers. In terms of the Social Security Administration's

concept of poverty income there were approximately 125 thousand clerical workers from poor families. However, most of the poor people in the labor force are in service occupations, or are unskilled laborers or farm laborers, with service occupations other than private household work being the most important and the most rapidly growing contingent in this population. Some of these poverty-prone occupations are among the most rapidly growing occupations in the economy. As Americans become more affluent, they demand more services. They want better health care, and the most rapidly growing occupations in the health field are the various types of aides or attendants who have just recently received the coverage of the federal minimum wage law of $1.60 an hour. As we become richer and move out to the suburbs and drive more cars, we require many people doing miscellaneous service jobs with automobiles, such as automobile and parking lot attendants, who again are typically in the poverty-prone occupations.

So far there have been few manpower programs aimed at the working poor, and most of the enrollees are people whose problem is unemployment. It is not very easy to devise programs coping with the problems of the working poor, particularly that large group which holds full-time jobs because this would involve training after work or while these people are working. Furthermore, in many of these fields, such as the hospital attendant fields, upgrading and moving these workers out of the field would create an acute shortage of people in hospitals. However, if we look at this population of the working poor, it seems to me that our goal in the next ten years will be to convert this group, so far as we can, into a kind of revolving pool. People will

enter this pool and may stay there for a year or two. Some of them may remain longer--perhaps receiving income maintenance supplements as well as the income from work. Many others will receive upgrading training to increase their job mobility. This group contains, as of 1966, about one-third of the total of the working full-time poor and include people who have had at least 4 years of high school education. If we are thinking in terms of full use of the economy's human resources in the 1960's, manpower programs serving the needs of the working poor are likely to figure much more prominently in the second half of the 1970's than in the 1960's.

CHAPTER 9

COMPLEX VARIABLES AFFECTING THE PLANNING PROCESS

Arthur A. Kramish*

I must confess that I have no blueprint for a workable planning system. However, I think it is clear that whatever specific mechanism may be created, its effectiveness will depend upon several variables. For example: information or data base, coordinative interests, manpower for planning, creativity of the people we are planning for, policies or issues, political structures, attitudinal patterns of agencies or organizations, and the individualities of heads or representatives of these groups.

Fundamentally, the object of planning is not planning, but action. The object of comprehensive planning is coordination of numerous actions that are often carried out as if they have no bearing on one another. If planning is to be meaningful, it must result in some coordination or integration of policies, programs, and administrative actions of all the agencies and levels of government affecting the community, state, region, or nation.

Coordination is only half the job, since the object is to achieve a more effective partnership in meeting needs. The scale of

---

*Assistant Regional Director for Planning and Evaluation, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Kansas City, Missouri.

many problems requires a broad attack for successful planning. Political structures inherited from the past usually lack resources, scope, and motivation to meet problems that transcend them. It requires adequate counterpart units to make programs go and meet the needs of constituencies. The haphazard way in which departments and bureaus are developing unrelated and uncoordinated planning requirements leads to a prolonged period of overlap and confusion that may seriously delay and even discredit efforts to coordinate planning and interdependent programs.

Planning has made very little contribution toward identifying or resolving human resource problems. Planners have been inclined to substitute technique for insight; jargon for relevance, rhetoric for strategy. Terms and phrases like systems analyses, PPBS, goals, coordination, linkages, and priorities, despite the best of intentions, have not become operational in a decision-making context. They have meant little to federal officials faced with an annual appropriation cycle and a recalcitrant Congress; a mayor whose resources are limited, whose agencies are hostile; a resident of the ghetto who is out of a job and whose kids are hungry.

In spite of good intentions, it is unfortunately becoming increasingly difficult for national, state, and local leaders to articulate and then make tough decisions related to collection and allocation of scarce resources. The political risks of making such decisions are apparently vastly compounded if the beneficiaries of public action are clearly the poor, the black, the chicano.

Our national dialog relative to priorities has become confused with such terms as "forced integration." Governors willing to propose fiscal reform have run the risk of single terms in office; mayors appearing too sympathetic with objectives of minority constituencies often survive in office only by tight pluralities rather than majority votes.

Structural reform has been the long suit of critics of American institutions. Unfortunately, the reformers have rarely achieved a coincidence between their proposals and the real world. Those who cry for decentralization and neighborhood government neglect to weigh economic and social benefits and costs; they refuse to become specific or selective concerning functions, services, and processes. Conversely, those who argue for placing more planning and resource distribution responsibilities in the hands of regional or state governments (and subsequently taking responsibility from city and federal government) must, if they are to become relevant, reflect in their arguments political as well as institutional realities. In essence, how many states are equipped (inclination or capacity) to accept more responsibility in the human resource area? What about national performance criteria? Why is "areawide planning" any better than city or neighborhood planning (better for all functions, services--for some functions and services)?

Communities generally do only physical planning. While providing many professionals with jobs and more consultants with contracts, initial planning efforts, given weak linkages to human problems and priorities and minimal understanding of market factors, have rarely had more than a cosmetic effect.

You may ask me why, if planning has been so irrelevant to the capacity of building needs of the country, Uncle Sam continues to push it. This is a tough one to answer. Presently there are over forty-five separately funded federal planning assistance programs. The total amount of money involved is somewhere near $250 million.

It is clear that many communities have become involved in federally aided planning efforts to secure other federal grants. That is, their commitment to planning is often only as strong as their desire for this or that grant which carries a planning prerequisite. Participation in federally funded planning efforts, as I indicated earlier, has not necessarily helped cities. In some instances, it is safe to say that a city's ability to effectively allocate scarce resources has actually been reduced.

The "hodgepodge" of federal planning aids reflects perhaps more the growth of federal categorical programs and parallel local recipient groups than any recognized need to help communities build capacity at the local level. Only Model Cities provides, in effect, a direct grant to city hall for planning purposes.

I am convinced that new planning ground rules are necessary if we are to develop local planning capacity which can help in allocating local resources. I might take a few moments and propose some for you. If followed, they should permit, for the first time perhaps, the development of a capacity to manage and strategically direct public and private resources to achieve "quality of life" objectives.

1. Too much time and thought has been given to planning structure instead of thinking about the roles of those who will

participate and relate to that planning structure. A proper planning structure is important, but there are no "best" forms; more important is the role of the organization or agency; the planners, and residents. If the community or organization leader "cops out" there is a loss in really developing a realistic planning base; there is a loss in effective coalition with resident groups around planning issues and priorities; the professional is permitted to set priorities and define programs.

2. The planning game should not be given over to consultants. HUD's 701 program has built many firms, but not developed much in the way of city hall capacity. Planning funds, either local, state, or federal, should be used to add competent staff. Consultants, if used at all, should come in only under a specific agenda, and for specific purposes.

3. Leaders, agency heads, executives should insist on reviewing and commenting on all planning assistance programs prior to using them.

4. One planning process should be developed. This process should have a clear link to improvement and budgeting programs. One process need not always imply one planner. The prime concern should be that all the diverse planners in an organization/agency, community, are at least communicating with one another; that issues are raised; debated; and resolved. In effect, a good information system may be better than a good plan or the brightest planners.

5. It is imperative that there be wide involvement in problem and priority selection as well as program development. Such

involvement means participation by individuals who because of income or color have been traditionally denied such a right. Ground rules will be difficult to define easily. Yet, Model Cities has taught us that city hall resident coalitions, despite occasional tensions and unnecessary rhetoric (on both sides) lead to a more realistic approach to defining needs, and more appropriate and relevant priorities. Such coalitions engender positive changes in agency behavior changes, which couldn't be achieved otherwise.

6. It is important to learn how to play the federal/state "Crap game." It's part of planning. Oft times the participants and the program are unknown to each other. Even if revenue sharing and consolidated grants are upon us, there will still be the need to deal with peers in Washington and the region; to negotiate with state/local counterparts. The system is uniquely complicated. Fortunately, or unfortunately, it will remain so.

7. Finally, planners should be asked to drop their pretenses, their jargon. My advice would be to fire these planners who ask to engage in "long-range synoptic---linked-----" planning. I would certainly question, except in defining general policy objectives, spending more than a marginal amount of time looking beyond two or three years at a time. Considering resource limitations and institutional constraints, planners ought to limit their prime attention to strategic areas of opportunity--areas in which there can be impact.

The ground rules that I have just mentioned should suggest a definition of planning much different from the one most everyone seems to be using in the towns and cities. Planning must be perceived as a process by which strategic management is accomplished and made operational.

CHAPTER 10

A SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP SESSIONS

The workshop session dealt primarily with four (4) areas of discussion. These were:

(1) What is manpower planning and what are the ingredients of a good manpower plan (objectives, data requirements, timing, implementation, evaluation, etc.)?

(2) If given a lump sum of money (revenue-sharing) for the manpower effort in your area, what should be the basis for its equitable distribution (target population, unemployment, job displacement, income, etc.)?

(3) Who should be responsible for program evaluation (clientele, parent agency, political subdivision, etc.)?

(4) Should the organization or agency implementing a particular program also be responsible for planning that program, or should planning and implementation be separate, i.e., a multiple-program planning body responsible for only the planning function? Why?

The workshop participants, working in four separate groups, were requested to discuss these four questions, as a group, then respond to them as individuals. There was no effort made during the discussions to arrive at a consensus. The responses are included elsewhere, as another part of this summarization.

These workshops included people who are involved daily with manpower programs, and who are aware of the bureaucratic influence on governmental programs, including manpower. This may have influenced the fact that the workshop discussions opened on a rather slow tempo, with what reflected a seemingly "what is the use" attitude.

The written responses to the first discussion topic - "What is manpower planning and what are the ingredients of a good manpower plan?" - should be considered in two parts. The first being - "What is manpower planning?" Responses included the following:

- Planning is a future oriented question - requires close cooperation between government officials and demands of manpower services.
- Manpower planning is intended to serve "people needs" - to provide ideas and recommendations for activities to meet the objectives of providing people with means of obtaining a relatively acceptable standard of living.
- Manpower planning is incorporating present and future needs of industry, retail, service and business coupled with people needing jobs, and job training.
- Manpower planning is a process of developing a model for a viable, flexible, realistic system to effectively

utilize human resources of the State in maximizing our individual and collective goals.

- Manpower planning is a comprehensive written system of evaluating the needs of people, developing a delivery system that meets the objective needs of the client and tells the community what, why and how to proceed.
- Manpower planning is cooperatively and objectively planned programs to meet defined manpower needs, utilizing the most effective and expeditious manner.
- Manpower planning is: studying the needs, putting needs in order of priority, setting objectives and goals in meeting priorities, designing and funding programs based on these.
- Manpower planning is making a determination of needs of the target populations and needs of the labor market and bringing the two together.
- Manpower planning is to meet the needs of the target unemployed group who are employable.
- Manpower planning involves the determination of occupational needs and development of employability.
- Planning in manpower should be concerned primarily with the needs of the poor.
- Manpower planning is the process of making the maximum utilization of human resources.
- Manpower planning is the comprehensive categorical listing of current and future problems of the people.

- Manpower planning is: identifying programs, shifting to work with workables, setting goals, establishing system to reach goals, establishing monitoring principles, and evaluation including follow-up with clients and receivers of the clients to determine goal accomplishments and relevance of the accomplishments.

After reviewing the responses submitted on this work project, it is necessary to proceed with efforts to determine what participants considered manpower planning to be--one possible understanding is as follows:

> "Manpower planning is a comprehensive written system of documenting identifiable needs of the employable, unemployed, and underemployed, evaluating these needs, establishing priorities and developing a viable, flexible, realistic delivery system that effectively and efficiently utilizes all available resources to objectively meet the needs of the target populations."

The general opinion of the participants is that local input in manpower planning is vital. Federal and state governments are expected to perform in a technical capacity, furnishing broad, flexible guidelines, thus permitting local planning bodies to plan according to local needs, rather than to conform to rigid guidelines.

The second portion of the first work project was "What are the ingredients of a good manpower plan?" Many of the responses were similar; therefore, the following listing of responses will generally include only those of varying intent or purpose.

- flexibility
- willingness to cooperate
- relative, accurate data
- system designed to reach established goals
- evaluation system
- clear statement of current problems
- identification of employer needs - current & projected
- clearly defined goals
- framework of accountability
- identification of existing resources
- monitoring system
- identification of those needing services - current & projected
- priority assignments

One of the obvious problems, as these ingredients are reviewed is - where do we start or in what order are these ingredients to be considered? They are all of equal importance, and unless all are included, the plan can not be as effective as it must be. In an effort to provoke some reaction on this subject, and after considerable thought, the ingredients identified as necessary to a good manpower plan, are placed in an order which seems logical.

- Cooperation
- Identification of people needs--present - future
- Identification of employer needs--present - future
- Identification of existing resources
- Identification of existing problems
- Evaluation (people needs to employer needs to resources)
- Assignment of priorities
- Definition of goals

- Designation of delivery system to reach goals (include in design capabilities to monitor, evaluate and follow-up, thus developing accountability capabilities)

During the discussions and as revealed by the written responses, participants volunteered comments on related ingredients that contributed to the effectiveness of the workshop. Some of the comments relative to this portion of the workshop are as follows:

- Broad plan objectives should be furnished from funding source.
- Data requirements should be broad with refining on the local level by local sources.
- Timing, implementation, and evaluation should be decided by local CAMPS with limited direction.
- Manpower planning can be accomplished without any increase in funds or creation of a new agency by:
  (1) Mobilizing existing manpower resources into a working entity
  (2) issuing a mandate that CAMPS form a mechanism for meaningful planning
  (3) provide state-level guidelines in terms of planning objectives
- If the Governor wants a good plan, he needs someone with authority to assure that State agencies cooperate and are on the same track.
- Establish facilities to obtain and provide any data that a local group requires - if this cannot be done, then allow the local group to base their goals and objectives

on their general knowledge of the area concerned. A review of past programs will determine if programs are meeting their objectives and goals.

- Local groups, while needing purpose, objectives, and goals, must be allowed a great deal of latitude in their planning. With our present system, it is not possible to determine one to two years in advance what type of individual training and what skill content is needed.
- An individual data bank should be built on the population, employment, population trends, and commuting patterns, etc.
- Cooperative effort is necessary on the part of all participants to provide meaningful exposure - training - in utilizing natural resources and incorporating new ideas in the cause of finding employment to meet the needs of a community, addressing training and exposures to a level of serving all in a community who have an employment need.
- Plans must be developed and implemented as close to the client as possible.
- Need ability to decategorize funds to meet local needs.
- Determine problems in community or state - request data from one local data bank in the State, Governor should determine what agency or agencies can best collect data - local people say training is needed while other agencies say there is no need.

- Prime need is a complete survey of the state and a program of needs and priorities built from that. Involvement of all agencies involved in manpower is necessary. Area and State CAMPS may have to take the initiative to encourage involvement.

These and many other constructive suggestions were offered in the interest of manpower planning.

Another area of discussion covered the question - "If given a lump sum of money (revenue-sharing) for the manpower effort in your area, what should be the basis for its equitable distribution?"

The question was answered in many ways; however, the most common response was "that it should be distributed on the basis of need."

Responses are included in this summary, which after review, indicate that the participants generally agreed on the "basis" for distribution, but the method of distribution would appear to be a major concern. The "political" influence is mentioned several times, which also indicates apprehension as to influence this factor may have on revenue-sharing vs. the actual needs.

Concern is also expressed relative to distribution between urban and rural population areas.

The workshops were also requested to discuss and respond as individuals to the question - "Who should be responsible for program evaluation?" The responses were somewhat influenced by the inclusion of examples parenthesized and made a part of the question. These examples included "clientele, parent agency, and political subdivision."

These evaluation possibilities were mentioned frequently, however several other possibilities were also identified. These are:

- Independent consultant firms
- Potential employers
- Disinterested outsiders who are competent to perform an impartial evaluation. Teams of experts from the universities have this competence.
- Anybody who is interested
- Separate committee versed in programmatic goals independent of political influence
- Highly trained professional staff who represents organizations with no vested interests

An evaluation process is necessary; however, unless it is accomplished by competent people who are capable of rendering a fair and impartial evaluation, this effort is useless. It appears that most people would welcome an evaluation system as long as it produced provisions for recommendations to improve areas where weaknesses were apparent.

An evaluator, to do an efficient job, would, it would seem, need to consult with clientele as well as work with the administrating agency. It is difficult to determine where and how "political subdivisions" would contribute much to an impartial evaluation; this of course would depend on the nature of the division.

An evaluation could be accomplished by anyone professional enough to recognize goals and objectives of a program and then weighing accomplishments against these goals and objectives.

The responses to the question "Should the organization or agency implementing a particular program be responsible for planning that program, or should planning and implementation be separate?" overwhelmingly identified both planning and implementation as being the responsibility of a single agency.

The apparent concern with separation is the impracticality of idealistic plans that are or may be produced by professional planners who will have no responsibility for implementation.

It appears that many program implementors would accept and consciously work with planning documents, if they had an opportunity to assist in the planning procedures and would be provided with an opportunity to review the plan and submit recommendations, prior to the plans final approval.

SUMMARIZATION OF RESPONSES BY

PARTICIPANTS OF WORKSHOP JUNE 10, 1971 AT THE

GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE ON COMPREHENSIVE MANPOWER PLANNING

Workshop Question

What is manpower planning and what are the ingredients of a good manpower plan (objectives, data requirements, timing, implementation, evaluation, etc.)?

Responses

- Broad objectives should be received from funding source.
- Data requirements should be broad with refining on the local level by local sources.
- Timing, implementation and evaluation should be decided by local CAMPS with limited direction.
- Must allow for flexibility.
- Manpower planning can be accomplished without any increase in funds or creation of a new agency by:
  1) mobilizing existing manpower resources into a working entity;
  2) issuing a mandate that they form a mechanism for meaningful planning;
  3) provide state level guidelines in terms of planning objectives.
- Define goal--future oriented cooperation.

- Future outlook, define goal, means to these goals, flexibility.
- Define goals, future oriented, cooperation.
- Manpower planning normally an exercise in futility.
- Willingness to cooperate is vital.
- If Governor wants a good plan, he needs someone with authority to assure that state agencies cooperate and are on the same track.
- Planning is a future oriented question--requires close cooperation between government officials and demands of manpower services.
- Defined goals--future oriented--framework of accountability.
- Establish facilities to obtain and provide any data that a local group requires--if this cannot be done, then allow the local group to base their goals and objectives on their general knowledge of the area concerned. A review of past programs will determine if programs are meeting their objectives and goals.
- The local group while needing purpose, objectives, goals must be allowed a great deal of latitude in their planning. With our present system it is not possible to determine one to two years in advance what type of individual training and what skill content is needed.
- Not enough attention is given to the following: 1) is a person suitable for a type of training or can he be made suitable?, 2) is the type of training relevant?, 3) is supportive service available?, and 4) is there follow-up?

- An eventual data bank should be built on the population, employment, population trends, commuting patterns, etc.
- Manpower plan is intended to serve people needs--to provide ideas and recommendations as to activities that can take place to meet the objective of providing people with the means of obtaining a relatively acceptable standard of living.
- Cooperative effort on the part of all participants to provide meaningful exposure--training--in utilizing natural resources and incorporating new ideas in the cause of finding employment to meet the needs of a community, addressing training and exposures to a level of serving all in a community who have an employment need.
- Manpower planning is incorporating present and future needs of industry, retail and service, business coupled with people needing jobs and job training. This should be done locally and passed on to the area and then up the line--implementation should be started immediately.
- Manpower planning is the process of developing a model for a viable, flexible realistic system to utilize effectively human resources of the nation, in maximizing our individual and collective goals. There is basic need for data to cover the scope of the problem and need inventories of local skills, programs, and

facilities for determining talents, and demand for skills and above all sensitivity to the feelings of people at the local level.

- Plans must be developed and implemented as close to the client as possible with the assistance of people with various expertise and talents.
- Manpower planning is a comprehensive written system of evaluating the needs of people, developing a delivery system that meets objective needs of the client and tells the community what, why, and how you will proceed. The ingredients are:

1) clear goal definition;

2) statement of coordination;

3) provision for rapid change of direction;

4) concise agreements with schools and sub-contractors on performance;

5) clearly defined job descriptions to prevent duplication;

6) monetary controls;

7) equipment acquisition, controls;

8) in-kind service agreements even where no money or write-offs are utilized;

- Manpower planning is cooperatively and objectively planned programs to meet defined manpower needs utilizing the most effective and expedious manner, program facilities.
- Manpower planning is: 1) identifying programs, 2) shifting to work with workables, 3) setting goals,

4) establishing system to reach goals, 5) establishing monitoring principles, and 6) evaluation including follow-up with clients and receivers of clients to determine goal accomplishments and relevance of the accomplishments.

- Identification of those needing services--identify by outreach--data by state not economically feasible, go to regional data system.
- Need clear statement of problems, objectives and/or goals and then assess data needed--what data are available and what data are needed.
- Determine what data is needed by various organizations pooling data.
- Set-up (Governor's) Advisory Committee to determine the data needs and data already available and then set-up a state clearinghouse for data.
- Accurate data.
- Evaluation of individuals or groups to determine what services are needed.
- Determine how many and kinds of occupations and skill level required of workers now; in one year; in five years.
- Manpower planning is: 1) studying the needs in the manpower field, 2) putting needs in order of priority, 3) setting objectives and goals in meeting priorities, and 4) design and fund programs based on the above.
- Determination of area's needs (number, types of unemployed).
- Local priorities must be assigned to target groups.

- Plan must have flexibility.
- Ability to decategorize funds to meet local needs.
- Plan should include: all resources, data that is now in existence, coordinate existing resources, all data collection should be at state level, localize the control of programs--evaluate in the same manner.
- Determine problems in community or state, request necessary data from one local central data bank in the state, governor should determine what agency or agencies can best collect data--local people say we need this training while other agencies say there is no need.
- Manpower planning is making a determination of needs of the target populations and need of the labor market and bringing the two together.
- Manpower planning aim is to meet the needs of the largest unemployed group who are employable. Agencies can evaluate their own programs.
- Manpower planning involves the determination of occupational needs and development of employability.
- Ingredients are identification of the total number of people in need of manpower and related assistance. Utilize the universe of needs data by geographic area as available through E.S.--inventory specific target groups receiving services from intake to job placement. Establish priorities by target groups at local CAMPS level.

- Ingredients include, valid and reliable information on clients and employers and assurance of funds--never will have all that is needed to plan, must have a known amount for a specific period.
- Planning in manpower should be concerned primarily with the needs of the poor. Objectives should be established statewide and locally. Data is helpful but should not be a barrier to definition of specific objectives.
- Objective of manpower plan is to plan to provide jobs, job training, for those needing the services, and identify persons in need of services--data should be supplied locally, planning should be for at least one year and preferably three to five years.
- Prime need is a complete survey of the state and build a program of needs and priorities from that. This would avoid duplication, etc., and funds will have to be made available. Involvement of all agencies, who are involved in manpower, is necessary. Area and State CAMPS may have to take initiative and inform all concerned, rather than waiting for their involvement.
- Good target definition--priority in allocation of funds.
- Should be a program to promote area economy through effective training and utilization of persons therein. Combine responsibilities--i.e., too many agencies working with same groups--some thought should be directed toward enforcing family responsibility (a

father of children forced to support them). Decrease number of programs, decrease emphasis on numbers game and get to assisting those who are trying to better themselves.

- A good manpower plan should: 1) meet the needs of the individual and community through development of objectives, and 2) an extensive and timing accountability plan to be developed to measure whether the objectives have been met.
- Ingredients are: needs of individuals, needs of employers, and a delivery system to implement the plan. Timing is most important--especially when funding new ideas and projects. Good evaluation system is also necessary.
- Manpower planning is the process of making the maximum utilization of human resources. Objective--to make people employable and obtain gainful employment. Data requirements--comprehensive information of individual needs. Timing--logical sequence--implementation--thorough knowledge of objectives, actions involved and effective administration.
- Coordination of all manpower programs should be the goal. Perhaps funds for staff to monitor data is the answer.
- Correct data for local area--realistic goals and objectives--evaluation should be on-going.
- Manpower planning is the comprehensive categorical listing of current and future problems of the people. When problems are understood, put a system together to solve them.

Workshop Question

"If given a lump sum of money (revenue-sharing) for the manpower effort in your area, what should be the basis for its equitable distribution?"

Responses

- Every sector requesting funding obtain their fair share based on need, regardless of power, politics or geographical location.
- Equal distribution between target population and unemployment basis.
- Distribution based on need rather than just population.
- Target area population and amount of supportive services needed.
- Junk this idea! Underemployment is relative. Give stipend to each individual and allow him to purchase services. Set-up escrow account for people, allow them to arrange for their services. This would make agencies more accountable to their clientele.
- Distribution should be based on need.
- CAMPS committees should have a major voice in equitable distribution.
- Distribution should be based on need and results.
- Distribution should be based on who can best perform the particular activity--experiment with two or more methods of performance with careful evaluation to determine which is best.

- Distribution should be based on State Plan (with minimum amount of political overtones), which meshes goals on a statewide and regional basis for efficient utilization of manpower resources. Plan based on present situations and based on goals.
- Heads of families with outmoded skills, youth, education programs aimed at vocational exploration.
- Low-income groups but not necessarily disadvantaged.
- It must be used for action, not planning. Should be distributed to agencies that can efficiently and effectively carry out program objectives. Must not all go to the large population areas.
- Should be used to train unemployed and underemployed. We want to find job openings and fill those jobs with people.
- Revenue-sharing seems to be a dead issue--if it should develop--there should be a survey of need and programs implemented, geared toward serving these needs.
- Distribution based on problems and needs. Should be "scientific" rather than "political" distribution.
- Equitable distribution must be given to unemployed and underemployed.
- Distribution by target populations--identifiable objectives.
- Factored formula including: properly identified target populations along with identification of their needs (people needs)--proper identification of job potential,

growth potential (employer needs)--availability of existing systems and/or availability at minimal cost to produce necessary "stepping stones" for the accomplishment of goals.

- Distribution by target groups--guidelines of who and how many must be identical throughout the nation. Data relative to target populations must be accurate, otherwise recommend total population of target age groups.
- Some formula could be developed using target populations and approximate cost of programs needed to serve these groups. A contingency fund could be used to meet emergencies or released later for meeting the needs of existing programs.
- A combination of target populations and will of a community to tackle the task will result in equitable distribution.
- Target populations.
- Needs of target population.
- The formula should be based on a variety of factors including: percentage of dropouts, percentage of unemployed, percentage of unemployed and employed poor--subjective factors will influence funding decisions--there is no such thing as the purely objective distribution of funds.
- Give to the agencies with the largest target groups.
- Provide jobs and training--identify persons needing service--develop jobs not now existing.

- Start at bottom and go up.
- Establish needs--establish priorities and allocate on this basis.
- Needs of individual--priorities must be flexible.
- Area's manpower service needs.
- Distribution must be based on needs--this would vary geographically--only local committees could determine this.
- Target groups that have been given priority.
- Distribution from state to local subdivisions will mean rural areas will get the "short end of the stick" and could possibly be worse off than they presently are.
- Distribution to be determined at the local level, with emphasis of all local agencies contributing their resources.
- Request each area to estimate cost if they were to accomplish their mission (honest effort), allocate available funds according to formula that will enable areas to accomplish an equal percent of that goal.
- We cannot handle it because we are governed by the nature of politics--our priorities tend to reflect philosophies which makes it even more difficult. With today's economy, it would be more proficient if we were to increase our technical ability in the framework of job development and career ladder building.

Workshop Question

"Who should be responsible for program evaluation (clientele, parent agency, political subdivision, etc.)? Why?"

Responses

- Combination of clientele and parent agency on the local level with limited guidelines from funding source.
- The sponsor, the administrating agency and clientele, combination.
- Measures of achievement of goals.
- From within and coordinating force from without.
- Both within and without the manpower agency--clientele should be included.
- Both from within and without.
- Independent consultant firm.
- Anybody who is interested--it's public money--the funding source is always going to make the decision on what evaluation is worthwhile.
- Who will evaluate the evaluator? Goals to be pursued must be clearly defined first.
- All affected or involved should take part--it should be on-going and related to stated objectives.
- All will evaluate--a research service might gather and submit facts.
- State and local participants.
- Combined effort--should include clientele, potential employers and realistic and honest evaluation by the administrative agency.

- A separate committee versed in programmatic goals independent of political influence.
- Manpower organizations, low-income, political subdivisions, all should have knowledge of local plans and activities.
- Primary requirement is objective, impartial evaluation. Evaluation should be done by a disinterested outsider who is competent to perform the evaluation. Teams of experts from the universities have this competence.
- Highly trained professional staff who represents organizations with no vested interests. Internal program evaluation can also take place for management purposes. Clientele evaluations are worthless but clientele can participate in assisting professional staff.
- Political pressures will force the parent agency to design an accountability system which will be clearly defined and understood.
- People with time and knowledge--trained to do the job and "make recommendations" for improvement or change rather than just evaluating and stating the project is good or bad.
- Need a base line for evaluation--before and after study--include clientele, local officials and administrators.
- Overall evaluation must be measured against major goals--analysis must be accurate.
- Funding source--program administrators--CAMPS committees and recipients of services.

- Both clientele and agency members--and funding source.
- Political subdivisions and clientele.
- Everyone involved. Funding source, program developers, clientele, employers.
- Joint effort of agency, clientele and community representatives (should be an extension of area CAMPS committees).
- Clientele and parent agency.
- Implementation and planning agency, outside or consulting evaluation on larger programs.
- Clientele, parents, bureaucrats and political representatives.
- Clientele should be involved with leadership from agency and local-state government.
- The division to which funds are given--perhaps just sit back and if programs go too far afield, slap wrists and perhaps withhold future funding--let voters decide.
- Agency and political subdivision.
- Combined, cooperative and interested group for an area.
- A good evaluation must include representation from clientele, parent agency, political subdivisions, lay individuals and private consulting agencies.
- Evaluation must come from all directions.
- Clientele, parent agency, political subdivision.
- Clientele with supervision from parent agency. Political subdivisions could be consulted at the convenience of

parent agency and clientele. Only the target groups can determine the value of a program as it relates to them.

- Evaluation from all sources should be considered--with final evaluation by the funding source.
- Clientele--parent agency--political subdivision.
- Get impressions from all segments and attempt to place in proper perspective via a board composed of a cross-section of clientele, parent agency, etc.
- Evaluation must come from all levels and be both critical and non-critical.

Workshop Question

"Should the organization or agency implementing a particular program also be responsible for planning that program, or should planning and implementation be separate, i.e., a multiple-program planning body responsible for only the planning function? Why?"

Responses

- Yes--the agency implementing the program should be responsible for planning--to have the most dedicated and successful program.
- Should be separate--planning department should never administer.
- They have to be together to carry out an action type of plan--separate input from many sources would be aids.
- Yes! Most of our planning is done at the "grass roots" level--they are the ones to suggest the types of changes in planning to make the programs most relevant.

- It is necessary to involve the implementers in the planning.
- Planning and implementing go hand-in-hand.
- Implementing agencies should be together since they will be able to account to each other.
- If planning and implementation are completely separate, the planning is unlikely to get implemented. They have to be combined if you want it to work.
- The program should meet the objectives of the planning body which should reflect realistic feasible goals--implementers might develop a program without meaning.
- Will assume accountability for success of own plan.
- The planning and operation should be by the same agency. If the program is going to require help from another agency, then it should be brought in for that part but made aware of the goals, objectives, etc.
- A coordinated effort is needed in all phases of operation, planning, action, and follow-up.
- Too many programs are designed by someone else, and never have anything to do with implementation. This should be done, implementation of programs, by the planners. This hopefully would eliminate many of the existing ills. Planners supposedly know what the intent of the program is that they have designed.
- The agency implementing the particular program plus those in the community who know the program.

- Planning and implementation should not be separated. If they are separated, the implementor may or may not support the plan. The idea is that manpower planners will work closely with the implementors. The big obstacles at present to effective comprehensive manpower planning are: bureaucratic obstacles, inadequate resource allocations.
- The program must be planned by the agency operating the program. Imposed programs are sure failures. Planning a joint reference frame with other agencies is helpful, but only as an assistance resource.
- The agency implementing a particular program should also be responsible for planning. With certain qualifications, a multiple-program planning body can establish priority areas for planning and then delegate the planning for total agency utilization for each priority to that agency or multi-agency.
- If an agency is responsible to the goals of the program, they should have a hand in the planning, otherwise they will feel that the operation of the program is not really their responsibility and will not put forth much effort to make it successful. Whether or not they do the total planning with the above concept is not, in my opinion, critical.
- Contract implementation and operation of program to only one agency to determine responsibility.

- The organization should be the principle planners with the planning body offering technical assistance and consultation in development and approval of the plan. The local agency or organization is far more able to evaluate the program. The evaluators can subsequently more effectively plan and implement new plans. Only the program planners can be held accountable for the program. If not done locally, implementors can pass the buck and shift the blame for its failures.
- Keep planning and implementation under one body control so proper accountability results where the responsibility rests. State planning that will provide for local control keeping in mind that the local body has as much right to fail or succeed in their part of the implementation and action program.
- There should be a mutual contract implementation.
- If evaluation is to be a joint effort, planning should also be done at least partially by others than agency implementing program. The agency should have primary responsibility but utilizing advisory boards, community councils, CAMPS, etc. would be desirable.
- One agency should be capable of planning and implementing a program.
- Implementing organizations or agency must be responsible for planning--planning and implementation must go together. The implementing agency knows what is needed, their capabilities, etc. which is the basis for planning.

In evaluating and holding the implementing agency responsible for the program, they could easily say the planning was the problem if things did not go right.

- Ideally, planning and implementation should be separate. To provide a holistic approach to the provision of manpower services, one group or agency must be responsible for the planning. In turn, program implementation responsibilities must be assigned to the specific agency or agencies best able to deliver a specific manpower service. This allows for "award and punishment" of program agencies based upon the quality of manpower services delivered. Finally, those agencies delivering manpower services should be allowed to have input back into the single planning group or agency.
- Organizations and agencies with leadership from local-state government should be responsible.
- More support of program if in on planning as well as implementation. One agency of the federal government has now asked clients to assume this role of planning and implementation. In the past client groups were not asked, but programs were planned and implemented without their knowledge or consent. Cannot plan self-determination on the part of individuals without their involvement.
- A planning body is only way to get comprehensive plan. Need time frame within the plan.

- Too many organizations are planning to attempt working with clients in too short a time and too much change is initiated and brought about before a submitted plan is given a chance to become operational. Again, combine present operations in old line existing agencies, have these agencies serve a given area, rather than having certain agencies having to operate in two or three overlapping areas, i.e., CAMPS area, Area School areas, social service areas, OEO, etc., on down the line.
- This cannot take place as the necessary funds to solve every area's needs is not going to become a reality. Therefore, planning and distribution of funds will have to continue at the state level.
- Yes--in part--but all agencies should be in on the final "OK" of the plan.
- Multiple planning body--impartial identification of needs and obligation of resources.
- A planning body responsible for only the planning function, but with recommendations from the agencies implementing programs, some input from the target population should be considered as the greatest value to the planning body.
- An agency has vested interests in preparing a plan. A multiple-program planning body would have to be responsible for more than a planning function.
- A multiple-program planning body at the local level must do the planning so that categorical fragmentation does not occur.

- Absurd to ask an administrator to understand and to be committed to a plan--he has no opportunity to influence.
- No--in dealing with coordination our biggest fault has been our lack of involvement in the total environment. This has caused duplication which is tremendously expensive. However, recognize that the changes during implementation cost time and money because of inability to communicate.